LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21 NUMBER 1255

Pan-America Stirs

The Pan-American Conference at Lima opened with universal determination on the part of all participants to resist Nazi and Fascist conquest on this continent, but it is extremely doubtful whether this determination will be translated into any definite undertakings for coöperation in defense. Many of the Latin American states are still closely bound to Europe and do not propose to accept even a shadow of North American tutelage. This country has two things to thank for the better regard which it now enjoys to the south—the clumsy tactics of totalitarian penetration, and the good-neighbor policy of President Roosevelt, a policy, however, which has not been accepted by many capitalist interests in the United States.

That this is the case is illustrated by events in Mexico. The government of Mexico is as strongly anti-Fascist as any in Latin America. But it has just agreed to sell a large amount of oil to Germany, accepting in return credits which must be spent for German products. Why? Because the American and British oil companies, whose wells it has expropriated under its own constitution and laws, have boycotted the sale of Mexican oil elsewhere throughout the world. Mexico must sell her oil somewhere. If these companies had accepted the good-neighbor policy—which implies obedience to the laws of the countries where investments lie—Mexico would not have been forced to deal with Hitler.

An augury of better inter-American relations and effective resistance to Nazi penetration was the Conference for Pan-American Democracy held in Washington. This represented the people rather than the government and, with its delegates from a wide variety of organizations in this country, evinced an enthusiastic determination to help in whatever was necessary for its purpose. With the assistance of many qualified experts it surveyed the whole problem and voted to continue the work it had begun. Better understanding among peoples and unofficial action is no less necessary than intergovernmental coöperation if democracy is to be served.

Embargo and Neutrality Act

Reports from Washington say that the chance of lifting the Spanish embargo is much brighter than it was. Opposition by American Catholics has lessened as Franco's bombardment of civilians has continued and as his allies, the German Nazis, have increased their persecution of Jews and Catholics. We are told that Prime Minister Chamberlain, whom Mr. Roosevelt is inclined to follow when he can, has begun to doubt the wisdom of giving belligerent rights to Franco. Mr. Roosevelt has been informed by many people that a Franco victory would greatly augment the power of fascism in South America. He therefore proposes, it is said, a political deal. He will cease his opposition to having Congress end the embargo (it is assumed congressional action is necessary) if in return the pro-Spanish elements will help him to get the Neutrality Act modified so that he can punish aggressors and aid their victims.

The New Republic has opposed the Spanish embargo from the very beginning and would rejoice to see it

CONTENTS

The Week 185
Editorials
Appeasement Till It Hurts 187
Scientists Against Nazis 188
For the Refugees 189
General Articles
From Munich to Memel . Henry C. Wolfe 190
How Much National Defense? . . . . . George Fielding Eliot 191
An English People's Front? . H. N. Brailsford 193
The Catholic Church in Politics: VI . . . . . Leo H. Lehmann 195
John Donne's Statue (verse) . John Peale Bishop 198
Shoot the Works . . . . Heywood Broun 199
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 200
Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 201
The Bandwagon 202
Correspondence 202
Books That Changed Our Minds . Malcolm Cowley 205
Books in Review
Mr. Thomas Blasts and Builds . . . . . Robert Morss Lovett 207
Anthology of a Mind . . . Philip Horton 208
Emily and Her Editors . Theodore Spencer 209
The Status of D. H. Lawrence . . . . . Harry Thornton Moore 210
New Books: A Reader's List 211

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1938, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lifted. We are also opposed, however, to the fundamental change in the neutrality law. We shall not repeat the arguments against it in detail; it is perhaps enough to point out that in China, as well as in Spain, the American government has in fact aided the aggressors and done little to help the victims, or has acted positively to hurt them, although the Neutrality Act was not applied in the Asiatic war. It is hard to see how Mr. Roosevelt, after these many months, can with a straight face ask the American people to believe that he has had a sudden change of heart. In any case, the Spanish war and the neutrality law have little to do with each other. The fight in Spain is not the kind of conflict into which we are likely to be drawn; the neutrality law was written to protect us in case of a war openly fought by a number of the great powers.

Democracies Say Please

Britain and France, in registering a protest against any annexation of Memel by Nazi Germany, because such action would be in violation of the Memel statute, have done the correct thing to keep the record straight. But if they believe it will have any effect on Hitler's action, they have forgotten their own recent agreements with him to settle all disputes by conference—agreements which guaranteed, in effect, that they would interpose no forceful veto on anything he might do as long as he did not attack them. If they did not fight for Czecho-Slovakia, they surely will not fight for Memel. Memel, unlike the Czech republic, was once a part of Germany; its population is overwhelmingly German; its strategic importance is far less; means of protecting its independence are totally lacking. It is a little late in the day to protest against violation of international agreements simply on the basis of the sanctity of treaties.

Cardinal and Coughlin

That not all Catholics in America agree with one another, or with the general political position of the Church, is a point that has been made many times recently by The New Republic and its correspondents. Striking additional evidence that we should not judge the whole Church by its worst spokesmen came a few days ago. Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago, just after returning to the United States from a visit to Pope Pius, made a statement sharply attacking Father Coughlin. The Cardinal's declaration, which was broadcast nationally, said that Coughlin is "not authorized to speak for the Catholic Church, nor does he represent the doctrine or sentiments of the Church." In view of the lies about the Jews which Father Coughlin has lately been disseminating, we are not surprised that Cardinal Mundelein should have felt forced to speak out. What does surprise us is that the Jersey City Council of the Knights of Columbus should have followed the Cardinal's statement by a resolution "approving" Coughlin's radio utterances. Nearly every factual statement Coughlin uttered has been proved to be false. Are the Knights of Columbus, like a character in "Alice in Wonderland," trying to demonstrate that they can believe almost anything if they only try?

Halifax, in His Hours of Ease

A friend of ours who reads Hansard, the British equivalent of The Congressional Record, sends us a startling quotation he recently came across. Lord Strabolgi speaking in the House of Lords October 4:

> Is he [Lord Halifax] still Foreign Secretary? I thought that the Foreign Office had ceased to function. I didn't believe the stories going around about the Foreign Secretary having so little to do that, with his colleagues in France, he was drafting a note to the Vatican praying for the canonization of Judas Iscariot; but I understood that the Prime Minister was doing everything and was carrying the whole burden on his shoulders.

A Great Reporter Dies

Paul Y. Anderson, who took his own life in Washington a few days ago, was one of the journalistic leaders of the nation. When he was only twenty-four, his work in covering the East St. Louis race riots resulted in commendation by a congressional committee. He won the Pulitzer Prize for his work on the Teapot Dome scandal, and he deserved it: it was his questions, fed to the late Senator Walsh of Montana, that broke the whole story. Brilliant writer, indefatigable investigator, he was the sort of newspaperman that journalism students dream of becoming.

While it may have had nothing to do with his tragic end, we cannot but regret the circumstances under which he left the paper that was his first love, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, about a year ago. A needless and trivial misunderstanding arose between him and an executive in St. Louis, and two hot-tempered men impulsively broke off a happy relation of many years' standing. Journalism will never be entitled to be called a profession until safeguards have been set up against such accidents as this. The Newspaper Guild is on the right track when it tries to make them less likely by writing rules against unilateral, arbitrary action by employers.

Believe It or Don't

At the moment, the world is reeling beneath our feet and for two reasons. First, Mr. Whitford Carter, writing in The New York Times, quotes the dictionary to prove that "allergic" does not mean what everybody supposes. The proper word is "anaphylactic." Indeed, "allergic" means an acquired immunity to anaphylaxis, the exact opposite of the popular understanding. This is startling enough, but worse is to come. We learn from Representative Martin Dies, the un-American specialist, that he planned to start a League for Peace and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americanism; that Herbert Bayard Swope offered to help him raise money; and that he ignored the offer because he had never heard of Mr. Swope. We don't know which astonishes us more: the fact that Swope, the red-headed cyclone of journalism, horse racing and Twenty Questions, should have been willing to help Dies, or that Dies had never heard of Swope.

Louis Stark, Labor Reporter

Several of our readers have objected to the statement in "The CIO Comes of Age," by Bruce Bliven Jr. (November 30), that Louis Stark's reports of the Pittsburgh convention, which appeared in The New York Times, carried a distorted impression of the "left-wing crisis." The substance of their objections is this: Louis Stark is, by and large, the best labor reporter in the country. By singling him out for special condemnation, Mr. Bliven gave the impression that The New Republic had some particular animus against him. They argue that there was in fact a serious, behind-the-scenes split in the CIO; that Mr. Stark acted strictly in accordance with the best canons of reporting in telling the facts about it. We are sorry if the reference to Mr. Stark was regarded as a personal attack on his integrity. Mr. Stark is the best labor reporter now writing for any of the "large-circulation" dailies, and the wording of the reference to his Pittsburgh stories seems to us to have made this implicit assumption clear. It said: "In the distorted reports which newspapermen sent to the dailies (including, I am sorry to say, even Louis Stark of The New York Times) a great deal was made of the 'left-wing crisis' which occurred on the convention's second day." The facts Mr. Stark reported about the split were accurate. We agree with Mr. Bliven, however, that his account of the convention gave more attention to the "crisis" than it deserved; that the impression of disunity contained in his reports was an unfair picture of a meeting remarkable for its solidarity.

News Notes of a Week

Japan has indicated more sharply than before that she considers the Open Door in China as closed henceforth and evermore. All foreign trade and investment will be by Japan's permission and on her terms. . . . The Chinese claimed victories in guerilla warfare in the north. In the south, they pushed a campaign the purpose of which is to retake Canton. . . . Reports from Spain continue to indicate that large numbers of troops, including many Italians, are being massed for a new offensive by Franco. He wants to win a big victory before Chamberlain's official visit to Rome. . . . Yezhov, touted a year ago as Stalin's possible successor, lost his most important place, as head of the Commissariat of Internal Affairs. He keeps another job as Commissar of Water Transport. . . . Additional support was gained for the Ernst Toller plan to have the democracies contribute surplus foodstuffs and other supplies worth $50,000,000 to aid the victims of war in Spain.

Anthony Eden, former British Foreign Minister, visited the United States and set tongues wagging as to whether he was here on behalf of the British government or in the effort to muster stronger opposition to it. . . . Cotton farmers voted by a wide margin for renewal of government control of crops, while tobacco and rice farmers rejected the plan. . . . The National Association of Manufacturers adopted an unexpectedly conciliatory platform. . . . The Supreme Court ruled against the National Labor Relations Board, refusing to permit appeal from a decision that seamen engaged in a sitdown strike were guilty of mutiny. In another case it held that either a Negro must be admitted to the University of Missouri Law School, or a law school must be created at Lincoln University, a Negro institution in Missouri.

Appeasement Till It Hurts

FRANCE, BY SACRIFICING Czechoslovakia at Munich and signing a pact of non-aggression with Germany, has not escaped attack from the southern end of the Rome-Berlin axis. Now that Hitler has gained enough territory to satisfy his appetite for a few weeks, Mussolini must go on to his next advance. His well trained cohorts are demanding annexation of Tunisia, Jibuti (the port of the French-owned railroad running from Ethiopia), a share of control in the Suez Canal, dominance by Franco in Spain, Corsica, and even Savoy and Nice in France itself. There is little doubt that the Italian government will formally press these demands. Germany, far from exercising a restraining influence in this matter, has chimed in with a demand for shares in the Suez Canal for herself and Japan as well, which would enable the three totalitarian powers to wrest control of the canal from France and England.

Though Frenchmen may be ready to sacrifice allies, they are quite unwilling to hand over any French property or any territory over which their flag flies. The empire is, in great measure, an affair of long history, and many shareholders both large and small depend on their colonial interests. Here is no matter of mere sentiment or even of strategic calculations having to do with national defense—though the well trained soldiers from French Africa would go far to supplement the man-power of the Republic in another war. It is a practical matter touching the French pocketbook, and any French government would prefer war to surrendering any substantial imperial interest.

If this is the case, why does Italy hope to gain anything by a demand of this character? To attack Ethiopia, even in the face of League opposition, is one thing, but to treat France as if she were Czecho-Slovakia is quite another. Gayda, the unofficial spokesman of Mussolini in foreign affairs, has already explicitly warned France not to repeat the mistake of her sister republic by resisting. Such boldness seems at first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely laughable. France could overwhelm Italy in open hostilities; her army is immensely superior in ability and equipment, and her navy could cut off Italy's chief sources of supply by sea. The spectacle of Italy attempting to take Tunisia in the face of the magnificent French "Army of Africa," to say nothing of trying to invade France itself, is enough to bring nightmares to torment the sleep of any realistic Italian general-staff officer; nor could any Italian admiral regard without shudders the thought of going out to meet eight French battleships with the Italian two. The Italian air force, it is true, is somewhat superior to the French, but against this must be set the far greater vulnerability of Italy, with her massed industrial areas and electric railways, to bombing attack; while her total lack of raw materials and indifferent food supply make it unthinkable for Italy to go to war with a superior naval power—save in the columns of the Giornale d'Italia.

No doubt Mussolini has inferred from the economic difficulties and the internal dissension in France that this "democracy" is ready to crack. It is true that the Republic has long suffered from the obstinate struggle between the capitalist interests and the progressive forces. France could emerge from her economic stagnation if the program of either could be carried out consistently, but she is helpless as long as the conflict continues unresolved.

Under Blum and the French "New Deal," labor won shorter hours, the right to organize and other reforms, but capital went on strike; much of it left the country and there was a diminishing activity of that which could not leave. Under Daladier with his decrees, compulsion has been applied to labor while capital is wooed. Daladier refuses to apply exchange control to prevent the flight of capital, though he lengthens the working week and suppresses strikes. It is not really a need for production that dictated the abandonment of the forty-hour week, since there are many unemployed. What was really wanted was lower labor costs and larger profits. The new tax measures increase the cost of living for the poor by heavy indirect taxes on common necessities. The tax on incomes of 12,000 francs a year is quadrupled, but the tax on incomes of over 500,000 francs is actually reduced. Labor is naturally resentful, and Daladier's majority in the Chamber is precarious. Yet the reactionary forces do not quite dare to suppress democracy for fear of civil war.

In spite of this deadlock, Mussolini would be rash to tempt fate in an actual war with France, for as soon as the first shot was fired, the ranks would close, and France would do what was necessary to win. French workers would prefer their own exploiters to Hitler and Mussolini. But of course Mussolini has allies—Hitler and Chamberlain. Hitler is the open ally; there is no doubt that he will support Mussolini until Italy's help is no longer necessary, that help will be necessary until France is humbled and Alsace is recaptured.

Has anyone forgotten the part Mussolini played at Munich? He assured the world publicly of his solidarity with Hitler, while privately he played on Chamberlain's desire for "appeasement" and friendship. He thus helped Hitler to carry away his prize without firing a shot. Hitler can play the same game, now that Mussolini is on the march. He can make both France and Britain believe that if war breaks out, he must come to the aid of his good friend. Neither nation will put any trust in his recent promises. But he will assure Chamberlain that he does not want war and that peace may be had—for a price. Of course France would be crushed if both Germany and Italy attacked her, and she did not have Britain's aid. Therefore Chamberlain will have an opportunity to press upon the French government the necessity for making sacrifices for peace. "Appeasement" may thus give Mussolini his bloodless conquest, just as it showered victory on his brother dictator. Meanwhile the superior financial power of the British can profoundly influence France, as it has in the past, to keep democracy in check and prevent a militant anti-Fascist movement from coming into power.

No doubt Mussolini is counting upon cowing the "great democracies" again by some such process. If he were not, his present course would be a mad courting of defeat. Will he succeed? Perhaps not in taking over Tunisia and Jibuti. But he might easily win a final sacrifice of Loyalist Spain and might even penetrate to a share in Suez. That would strengthen both ends of the axis for the next adventure. Appeasement would have taken another step toward its goal of totalitarian conquest.

Scientists Against Nazis

ONE OF THE WEIRDEST ASPECTS of the weird Nazi ideology is its attack on pure science. The Nazis try to argue that there must be no scientific theory—by which they mean that there must be no theory except their own barbaric notions of race differences and the like. They have now been impressively answered by a great group of American scientists, who say:

> we publicly condemn the Fascist position toward science. The racial theories which they advocate have been demolished time and again . . . the charge that theory leads to "a crippling of experimental research" is tantamount to a denial of the whole history of modern physics. . . . We firmly believe that in the present historical epoch, democracy alone can preserve intellectual freedom. Any attack upon freedom of thought in one sphere, even as non-political a sphere as theoretical physics, is an attack on democracy itself. When men like James Franck, Albert Einstein or Thomas Mann may no longer continue their work, whether the reason is race, creed or belief, all mankind suffers the loss. They must be defended in their right to speak the truth as they understand it. If we American scien-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tists wish to avoid a similar fate, if we wish to see the world continue to progress and prosper, we must bend our efforts to that end now.

To this stirring declaration are signed the names of 1,284 Americans, headed by Professor Franz Boas of Columbia, outstanding American anthropologist and former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Included are three Nobel Prize winners—Urey, Millikan and Langmuir; representatives of 167 universities; 85 college presidents, deans or other heads of institutions; and such well known individuals as Professor Wesley C. Mitchell of Columbia; Dr. Henry E. Sigerist of Johns Hopkins; Professor D. J. Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, editor of Science and Society; Dr. Milton C. Winternitz, professor of Pathology and former dean of the Yale Medical School; Dr. Karl M. Bowman, professor of Psychiatry at New York University, and scores of other distinguished American men of science. The fact that so many of these eminent individuals, who are not in the habit of entering the realm of public controversy, feel impelled to speak out at this time shows how seriously Americans are taking the Nazi threat to civilization. It shows too the growing realization that nobody can any longer afford to remain "above the battle." The scientists have come down out of their ivory towers and enlisted in a struggle which involves nothing less than the survival of civilization.

For the Refugees

GERMANY'S program of robbing the Jews is likely to take a new form. The Nazis propose to exchange the Jews they control for foreign trade. For example, a wealthy German Jew may be allowed to escape from the fatherland with three or four poor Jews in his custody, if he can find friends abroad to buy enough German exports to meet the cost of the emigration. Germany is suffering from a serious shortage of foreign exchange. The Nazis have stolen virtually everything they can from the Jews within Germany's borders. Now Hitler proposes universal blackmail.

Earl Baldwin, the former British Prime Minister, has added his voice to the chorus of distinguished men and women who plead for assistance for the victims of persecutions by Nazis and Fascists. In a radio broadcast he announced the Earl Baldwin Fund, a British organization to coördinate the work of all British refugee groups. Already the public has contributed more than $2,500,000. Baldwin's work and his appeal for additional money were supported by Pope Pius and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In the United States, as well, sizable resources of energy and money have been offered to help these victims. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has given her support to the proposal for a "Léon Blum Colony" in Palestine as a refuge for the hundreds of thousands of uprooted Jews. At Carnegie Hall in New York City a mass meeting was held a few days ago to protest the persecutions and to give impetus to the campaign to raise relief funds. Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia was the principal speaker on a list that included Bishop Manning, Bishop Donahue, Monsignor Sheen, former Ambassador William E. Dodd, Secretary Wallace, Senator Theodore Green of Rhode Island and Gertrude Atherton. Many private organizations are devoting their full energies to the refugees, notably the Joint Distribution Committee and the American Jewish Congress. In addition to the public officials who are struggling with the problem, many private individuals are doing hard, unselfish work. Eddie Cantor, the comedian, is one of these. At a meeting of Harvard undergraduates to launch a student refugee-fund campaign, Mr. Cantor said he would "rather have the younger generation hailing band leaders than heiling bund leaders." Harvard University itself has offered twenty $500 scholarships to refugee students on condition that each recipient be given an additional $500 from the funds the undergraduates themselves raise. The students at Columbia Law School have organized a coördinating committee to centralize the work of several groups in the various branches of Columbia University. They hope that Columbia can make a similar offer.

While people and agencies of good will work on the problem, the chief source of the tragedy, the Nazi government, makes matters worse. With the proposal for the exchange of Jews for foreign credits came an announcement of a "moderation" of the oppressive anti-Jewish decrees. But the "ghetto ordinance," barring Jews from certain streets and public places, has just gone into effect. The Jews are no longer allowed to sell real estate and their bank deposits have been virtually confiscated. And on New Year's Day the Nuremberg racial laws will become effective.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors
BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors
H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD *Advertising Manager*
BYRON DEXTER *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Munich to Memel

The "Peace of Munich" Reaches Lithuania

PRE-MUNICH CZECHO-SLOVAKIA was not only a bulwark for France and Britain, she was the first line of defense of the other small nations in Central Europe and the Balkans. Rumania's western military outpost, for example, was not her fortifications along the Hungarian frontier, but the Czech "little Maginot line." And so it was with other states in the path of the *Drang nach Osten*. When the "peace with honor" dismembered Czecho-Slovakia, it struck a blow at every other nation that is marked for "development" by Hitler.

One of the first countries to feel the effects of Munich is Lithuania. That small state, lying just across the Niemen from East Prussia, has long occupied a post of danger. The border with the Reich is one of those "bleeding frontiers" that Hitler has vowed to cure with his *Machtpolitik* surgery. The principal point of dispute between the Nazis and Lithuanians is the Memel territory, a stretch of sandy land skirting the bleak shore of the Baltic. Before the War, Memelland was part of Germany. It is one of the ironies of post-war history that the Lithuanian seizure of this area, in January, 1923, helped undermine the prestige of the Weimar Republic within the Reich.

Fifteen years later, Memel has become a place of refuge for thousands of liberals, pacifists and Jews from the Third Reich. Although the majority population of the Memel territory is undoubtedly German, it would entail suffering for its proscribed refugees to turn this region back to the Reich. But Memel—indeed all of Lithuania—has enormous strategic importance. It is the link between Germany and Latvia, a way station from the Reich to Estonia, a base of Nazi operations against Leningrad. It lies on the route followed by the Teutonic Knights seven centuries ago. It is on the northeast path of the *Drang nach Osten*.

Less than a month after the Munich conference, Herr Dr. Goebbels' own newspaper, Der Angriff, voiced this authoritative warning to Lithuania: "There is one thing about which the people in Kaunas [Lithuanian capital] must be perfectly clear. A policy patterned after that of Mr. Benes must needs be as damaging for Lithuania as it has proved damaging for Czecho-Slovakia. Memellanders want their autonomy. They demand it complete and unlimited."

It will be noted that in Lithuania the Nazis are using the same technique of stream-lined aggression that worked so successfully in Austria and Czecho-Slovakia: the creation of a Nazi "Fifth Column" within a neighboring country. Autonomy for Memel means actually a Nazi Memel modeled after the pattern of Danzig. It means turning the "Memelgau" over to Dr. Ernst Neumann, "the Henlein of Memel," and his Nazi followers. The Lithuanians know this, but there is little that they can do. Well do they realize that after Munich an appeal to the League or to the Western democracies is a waste of breath.

Agricultural Lithuania, with only two and a half million people, could not offer serious resistance to a German invasion. Indeed, the Wehrmacht garrison at Königsberg could easily sweep the Lithuanian army aside and march into Memel, or to Kaunas. A Nazi Putsch in Memelland would be a simple affair to stage. But, strangely enough, for the present there is a strong deterrent to such drastic action. That deterrent is the attitude of Poland.

Although Hitler is no longer dependent upon Polish neutrality to the extent that he was before Munich, he still is not ready for a rupture with this neighbor which cuts the Reich in two. So far he has avoided an armed adventure in Memel, because such a project meets with determined opposition in Warsaw. The Poles have never given up their dream of a reunited Polish-Lithuanian state, and they realize that a Germany established in Memel would place another stone in the wall of German encirclement of Poland. Furthermore, Lithuania figures in Colonel Beck's plans for a "Third Europe," a cordon of buffer states under Polish leadership scattered from the Gulf of Finland to the Aegean, that would block Hitler's drive to the East.

Part of the Nazis' so-called Rosenberg plan envisages "solving" the problem of the Polish Corridor by trading Lithuania to Poland in exchange for the Corridor. It is a project that meets no favor in Poland, but the Nazis continue to propagandize it. A premature Nazi *Putsch* in Memel might, therefore, produce complications with Poland that would interfere with Hitler's long-range expansion program.

Under the circumstances the Lithuanians appear to have only one course open to them: that is, to try to improve relations with both Poland and the Reich. The Lithuanians apparently lack a politician capable of playing the Nazis and Poles against each other. Consequently, Kaunas is striving to reach a *modus vivendi* with Hitler and at the same time establish better relation with Poland. What this actually means is that Lithuania will be compelled to enter the German orbit, to become an economic and political vassal of the Reich. This is another by-product of the "peace of Munich."

HENRY C. WOLFE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Much National Defense?

DURING THE COMING SESSION of Congress, it is safe to predict that national defense will be a much used and much abused term.

In itself, as applied to American strategical problems, it is a contradiction. The military policy of the United States has its foundation in sea-power, that is, in a properly constituted navy with suitable bases in strategic locations. But a navy, in war, is inherently an offensive instrument. The basic purpose of the United States fleet is the defense of this country; but to accomplish that purpose, once it comes to fighting, the fleet must act offensively against the fleet and sea-communications of the enemy.

Misconception as to the proper employment of the navy is widespread. Only a few days ago, the writer listened to a radio broadcast in which one of our leading peace advocates said that to him the idea of a navy big enough to defend South America from attack was fantastic, pointing out the vast distances which a fleet would have to go from any of our bases in order to defend Buenos Aires or Valparaiso. He apparently cherished the delusion that in order to defend those seaports, it was necessary for our fleet to go and sit in front of them. Ideas of this sort spring from the loose construction put upon the word "defense." As a matter of fact, the place for the initial assembly of an American fleet defending Buenos Aires against European attack is in the Caribbean Sea, from which central location it commands the communications of any European force entering the South Atlantic through the "bottleneck" between the coasts of Africa and Brazil, and can act offensively against such an expedition. Indeed, the mere presence of our fleet in this position would make it highly unlikely that such an attempt would be made until the fleet had been disposed of.

It cannot be said too often that the ultimate object of all naval operations is the control of sea communications; the securing of them for one's own use, whether military or commercial, the denying of them to the enemy.

This means offensive warfare; it means the vigorous employment of naval forces against the enemy's sea-lanes, in order to control them, or against the fleet if that be within reach. In the end, the enemy must either give over his use of sea communications, or bring his fleet out to fight for them. It is in this manner that the United States navy must operate in war, in order to dominate the oceans to the east and west of us, to prevent their use by enemy forces, to defend the American continents from attack and to prevent the establishment anywhere in this hemisphere of hostile air or naval bases by means of which we might be seriously threatened.

It is upon naval operations so conducted that the real defense of this country and its neighbors, whose security is bound up with our own, must rest. It is in the very grave risk which a fleet powerful enough to accomplish such objects imposes on any potential enemy, that our best safety from having to fight at all is to be found.

This matter of risk is one of the fallacies of the "static defense" idea, of the connotations of that word "defense" in so many minds. Time and again, well meaning people have said to the writer: "But if we had 5,000 —or 10,000, or 20,000—airplanes, nobody could come over here and do us any harm." Others, again, conceive of defense as a row of guns along the coast-line. Many years ago, a gentleman prominent in the political life of this country wrote a most plausible article outlining a scheme of defense which consisted of three rows of submarine mines laid around our coasts. The trouble with all these schemes, with every plan which is defense pure and simple, is that it imposes no greater risk on an enemy than that his attack may fail. It requires the defender to be strong everywhere—which means being weak everywhere—and leaves all initiative to the attacker. It abandons to him everything outside the range of our airplanes or our seacoast artillery. It leaves him in full possession of our sea communications outside those limits. And in the end, against a determined attack, it would mean the regimentation of the whole of the resources and industry of this nation in a terrible defensive war fought on American soil.

One difficulty that will be encountered in building a well coördinated system of defense in which both navy and army will bear their proper share, each in turn supported by an adequate air force, is the incurable enthusiasm of our people for bright new toys—for gadgets, as the navy puts it. The latest gadget is the airplane. Aviation has captured the imagination of American youth—as well it may—and its advocates have to a large extent captured the imaginations of our Congressmen. Not long ago, when a party of Congressmen were visiting Hawaii and were being shown the magnificent defenses of the great fortress-island of Oahu, it was noticeable that such things as sea-coast artillery, new roads for moving mobile troops, minelayers and tractor-drawn six-inch guns left them quite cold, while they were immensely enthusiastic over the big patrol planes and the new bombing base at Hickam Field.

Now we are being informed that the army air force needs 10,000 combat planes—presumably because of rumors that Germany has that many. Aside from the fact that the German rumors, on a basis of German post-Munich admissions, are about three times magni-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fied, one would like to have some of our armchair air strategists work out a scheme by which those 10,000 German planes or any number of German planes at all beyond the 100 or 120 which may be borne in the two German aircraft carriers (still on the building ways) could make a concentrated attack on our Atlantic seaboard.

They could not, until Germany had established an air base on this side of the ocean; and to obtain such a base, she would have to send warships and troops to fight for it. Even if the future brings aeronautical development to the point where planes carrying military loads can cross the Atlantic and return without refueling, it will still not be possible to envisage a huge air attack on New York or Washington, given proper defensive measures on our part, by reason of the difficulty of coördinating the movements of such a large force as would be required, operating at such a distance from its base, under unknown weather conditions and against resistance not only from the air but from the ground. Certainly the greater part of the raiding force would never see the shores of Europe again. Sensible people—and there are few more sensible warriors than German staff officers—do not make war by throwing away powerful forces for uncertain and perhaps wholly illusory gains.

The danger to our national defense in all this is not from a foreign foe, but from the consequences of our own folly. Take this matter of 10,000 army airplanes. Aeronautical science is advancing very rapidly; today's miracle is obsolete tomorrow. The assembling of a greater number of planes than would be reasonably adequate to the immediate demands of a sudden initiation of hostilities is therefore a waste of good material. But what is the level of this reasonable adequacy? As far as the navy is concerned, we have two principal types of planes: those borne in ships, the number of which is of course proportionate to the requirements of the ships themselves, and those to be operated from shore bases—the big flying boats, or patrol planes, and the planes assigned to the Marine Corps. The figure of 3,000 planes now established for the navy is ample to meet these needs and the needs of training. The army's official maximum is that fixed by the Baker board, after long and careful study—2,320. Of these, about 1,000 form the General Headquarters Air Force, the concentrated striking force for the continental United States. It is not easy to imagine any initial effort toward establishing a base in this hemisphere, or any raiding affair conducted from ships, that could not be met by such a force. The success of such efforts, in any case, is very largely controlled by factors quite outside the number of planes we possess. Of the remaining 1,320 planes, some 500 are earmarked for Panama and Hawaii, 400 for training purposes, 200 for cargo and transport, and 200 for observation and liaison duties at home. In the last category, a slight increase might be advisable; but in general the allotment of 2,320 planes to the army seems sufficient for the immediate needs of a sudden war. The economical way to handle the situation is to have annual replacements to keep this force fully modern in all respects, and to have such arrangements with industry as shall ensure a rapid and orderly speed-up of production when the emergency arrives.

If, on the other hand, we now allow ourselves to be led into wasteful extravagance and overproduction by the hysterical clamor of people who want our air strength immediately lifted to astronomical figures, we shall experience the inevitable reaction when the day of retrenchment comes, and the advocates of reasonable and necessary national defense will be sadly put to it to save what is really needed from the axe of an economy wave of public and congressional opinion.

Another danger to sound military policy is the tendency now apparent to hook up the national-defense program with certain projects of social and internal reform, such as the rehabilitation of our railways, a power program, housing and even soil erosion. That improvements in these matters make an indirect contribution to national defense; a mistake from both the military education, agricultural adjustment, sound financial policies and many other things—indeed, the argument can be made as to practically every department of governmental activity. It will be a very grave mistake, in the writer's judgment, to attempt the accomplishment of non-military objectives under the cloak and title of national defense; a mistake both from the military viewpoint and that of those who have these other objectives closely at heart. As to the intrinsic worth and practicability of these objectives, the writer offers no opinion, these matters being beyond the proper province of the soldier; but it is necessary to point out that the American people show a definite tendency toward dislike of schemes for "putting over" legislation which appear to be a trifle too clever. National defense is popular at the moment; its popularity ought not to be used to advance other plans, which may in the event prove not to command the support of the people. Otherwise, not only will the objectives sought fail of achievement, and similar plans be in future subjected to even more hostile scrutiny by those who will begin to examine everything for hidden jokers; but national defense will suffer by its association. If these various plans are sound in themselves, let them stand on their own merits. If not, the imperative needs of national security should not be jeopardized by being grouped with these extraneous matters.

Take the matter of a Committee of National Defense, hitherto advocated by this writer as an essential to careful and coördinated planning. In its original form, this suggestion was for a permanent committee to be composed of certain Cabinet officers, the Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations and the chairmen

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and senior minority members of the related committees of the Congress, to study the needs of our defense forces and our military policy and to establish the broad lines upon which that policy should be conducted; a committee which should, however, be purely a consultative and planning body, without executive authority and without any power to interfere with the independent conduct of their proper duties either by the executive departments concerned, or by the various congressional committees. Now we hear of a "super-committee" to handle national-defense legislation, a committee whose scope is apparently intended by its proponents to extend to such matters as railways, public utilities and the like, and will inevitably seek to take over much of the authority now properly vested in the committees on naval, military and foreign affairs and on appropriations. Under such a set-up, friction and difficulties are inevitable. The distinction is of course one between centralized planning and centralized authority. It is a distinction whose dangers must be perceived in time, or again the whole vitally important cause of needful national defense may suffer.

These are some of the warning signals which we perceive as we move toward the date when the new Congress convenes to consider the policies which shall, in future, affect the safety and independence of our Republic. It is to be hoped that neither the advocates of extravagance nor those of placid content with the status quo will dominate congressional councils. Either way lies peril. Perhaps never in our history has it been more necessary that sound and rational thinking should control our military policy. Today's world is not one in which a free people can safely disregard the temper of the national sword. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

An English People's Front?

ENGLISH LIBERALS AND SOCIALISTS are asking the question whether the victory won at Bridgwater in a by-election by Mr. Vernon Bartlett heralds a new epoch in the politics of this island. He stood as an independent progressive, had the support of the local Liberal and Labor Parties, was ignored by both the national machines, and none the less captured a safe Tory seat by a comfortable majority. Was it merely a personal triumph and a local phenomenon, or does it mean that events and the instinct of the masses will compel the reluctant parties of the Left to form the alliance that offers the only hope of victory?

Your correspondent hesitates to give rein to his own hopes, but the facts shall speak for themselves. Bridgwater is the last constituency from which one would expect a quick reaction to events, above all to external events. It is one of the greenest patches of England; the rich soil of its plowed fields alternates with marsh and moorland. It has memories of Monmouth's rebellion and of the Lake poets; every village has its Tudor church, and for the rest—what is there? I remember a big brewery and a pottery that still does good traditional work, a Quaker settlement with a textile factory and that is all that distantly approaches modernity. An ancient memory of former Whig ascendancy and Nonconformity still lingered when I knew it twenty years ago, but its politics for half a century have been steadily Tory. Yet without the aid of any party machine this typical rural constituency broke with its Tory past.

If one could be sure that this, given a Liberal-Labor alliance, might happen anywhere, one might face the future with hope. But candor compels me to report that two far from typical factors played their part in this election. Even these rural voters were horrified by the news of the German pogroms. Under the influence of this fresh impression, a majority of them cast their ballots against Mr. Chamberlain's policy of fraternization with this barbarian power. But would they do this a month hence when this ghastly news will be stale? One is not sure. Again, Mr. Vernon Bartlett was an exceptionally able and popular candidate, for a big proportion of the electors already knew him as broadcaster and journalist, and respected both his ability and his independence. He faced a rather immature and commonplace opponent.

In estimating the significance of this election one has to remember that the previous essay at Oxford was only mildly encouraging. There a strong candidate, Mr. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, who came very late into the field as an independent progressive (after the Peace of Munich but before the Nazi pogroms) reduced the Tory majority by half, but failed to win the seat. The factor of time may be significant. Oxford polled under the first impression of relief, because war had been averted; Bridgwater had seen something of the consequences of the Anglo-French capitulation.

My own impression is that the instinct of the masses is sound, but that it can achieve little without bold leadership and effective organization. The Liberals are now ready to welcome an alliance with the Labor Party and even with the rebel Tories, for the alternative that faces them is gradual extinction. This is the attitude both of their leaders and of their rank and file. The Labor Party presents a more complicated spectacle. Though a few of its leaders are known to favor the idea of a People's Front, its governing bodies as a whole seem immovable, incapable alike of a generous gesture or of a shrewd calculation. But under this inertia the rank and file grows visibly impatient.

Spontaneously at Oxford and Bridgwater the local

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties, each well aware that they had no chance of victory without Liberal aid, broke all the party's rules and contracted an alliance, while "Transport House" (to give the Party's headquarters its usual name) frowned in silence. Even more significant was the behavior of a brilliantly successful unofficial conference attended by 120 constituency Labor parties which met in London on October 23. It was a rebel gathering, called primarily to devise help for Spain, because the official Party had this year refused to summon the customary representative conference. I happened to be its chairman and recall now with some amusement our fears that few would dare to attend it and our caution in drafting resolutions. By a large majority it insisted on passing an emphatic declaration which called on the Labor Party to take the lead in forming an alliance of all the democratic forces.

The case for this alliance will be readily understood. It is Mr. Chamberlain's policy to bring the two Western democracies into a four-power concert with the two powers of the Axis. Russia will be driven into the isolation of her steppes, and Spain handed over to Italian domination. With France encircled and the whole of Central Europe within the orbit of the German Reich, it is clear that the two democracies would have to accommodate themselves to the will of the stronger military combination within this concert. No effective resistance will be possible in the future, if Spain is sacrificed and Russia finally alienated. This issue dwarfs every other, an irresistible case for the creation of a united opposition. No sober student of politics would argue that the Labor Party can possibly attain a majority in the next general election. It has no magnetic leader. Its general staff inspires neither interest nor confidence. Finally, it makes no progress in winning rural seats; yet without some of these it can never achieve even a bare majority. Why, then, does it refuse to consider an alliance with the Liberals, who hold some rural seats and might with the aid of Labor capture more? They still have a vigorous press and retain even in urban constituencies an appreciable, if dwindling, following. They command a capable team of officers, whose moral qualities stand unusually high, since this party has been purged of its self-seekers by many successive splits.

The jealousy that is a common failing of politicians may account in part for the dislike with which the Labor leaders view any suggestion of an alliance. In this case it is reinforced by class antagonism. Moreover, Labor believes that if it waits a few years the Liberals will disappear and it will be left as the sole party of Opposition. Why, then, should it save a rival group from extinction? That consideration weighs most heavily with the right wing. The Left tends, on the whole, to favor an alliance both with the Liberals and the Communists, whose energy and devotion far exceed their negligible numerical strength. But part of the Left sincerely and all the Right with less singleness of mind raises another objection; this alliance with a middle-class party would indefinitely postpone any hope even of a gradualist advance to socialism. This argument would be formidable only if Labor had a hope of attaining power at an early date. But the assumption that the Liberals would veto every advance in a socialist direction is, I am sure, mistaken. If that is so, the moderate instalment they accepted would then be defended against the Lords and the powers of finance by a more formidable army than Labor alone could muster.

The real objection to this alliance is something subtler than any of these reasons: Labor in its upper ranks shudders at the prospect of victory. Certainly it would entail in the present state of Europe a heavy responsibility. In private, an influential Labor leader said the other day that he opposed every suggestion of an alliance, because he was convinced that on the very day a People's Front ministry was formed, Hitler would bomb London. The same timidity prevails in France. M. Léon Blum said last week that no Jew and no Socialist ought to accept the premiership if it were offered him, since by so doing he would expose his country to Germany's enmity. This may seem an exaggeration, but did not Hitler warn Englishmen against permitting Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden or Mr. Duff Cooper to hold ministerial office? The plain fact is that the independence of the Western powers is in danger, so long as they stand isolated in a position of military inferiority. The first condition of independence is the free exercise of a nation's right to choose its governors. Alike in England and in France, the fear that this brutal power inspires has for a moment eclipsed in many minds the will to use this right.

While the official Labor Party hesitates, Mr. Eden has made in a series of speeches what is widely interpreted as a bid for the leadership of a progressive coalition. His is an attractive personality. He won general respect by his resignation on the Italian question. Little is known of his views on social questions, though the warm if vague phraseology of these speeches suggests that he regards himself as a Tory Democrat friendly to social reform. Few perceive in him as yet the strength and dynamic purpose required for an adventure of this kind. The Tory rebels in the House, who number from forty to fifty men, are cautious in the extreme, and few of them in any of the many crucial debates of recent weeks have dared to defy party discipline by voting against the government. They fall, moreover, into two groups. A few are progressives as advanced as any Liberal. But the majority are diehard imperialists of the school that followed Mr. Churchill in opposing a very moderate measure of self-government for India. To split is against every Tory tradition: this tendency has always been a Liberal habit.

What is conceivable is that the rebel movement may grow silently behind the scenes, with Lord Baldwin's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

support, until Mr. Chamberlain finds his ascendancy undermined. Then, without a struggle or a secession, Mr. Eden might glide into the leader's chair. But such an event is still a long way off. Mr. Chamberlain is the tougher personality of these two, and he has formidable forces on his side. The first of them is the dread of war, which some can rationalize in the noblest moral terms, while others are content to shiver without disguises. That any evil is preferable to war was for a brief moment after the Munich meeting the feeling of a majority (though not a large majority) of this nation. This sentiment is the more easily entertained when the evil in question falls on others. Second, one has to reckon with Mr. John Bull, who boasts that he knows nothing about Czechs and cares less. Spaniards are even further outside his range of vision. Finally, behind Mr. Chamberlain there are small but powerful financial groups, which reckon on investing their surplus capital in China, Spain and Central Europe, when the Fascist powers have completed their military operations. This anticipation of profitable business lessens the temperate disapproval which these persons might normally feel towards fascism. Finally, resistance would have entailed an alliance with the Soviet Union, which John Bull and the City would both view with extreme repugnance.

Against this school of thought which finds Mr. Chamberlain a reliable, if not a brilliant leader, stand the Tory aristocrats, for whom the day of rebellion is always tomorrow. They do not share the sympathy of the Left for the Spaniards and Czechs. But rather tardily they have seen the peril to the British Empire, if all its strategical outworks are surrendered. The empire is their prime concern, but they inherit the instinctive power of judgment which tells them that the empire can be defended only by an active manipulation of the European balance of power. With the Liberals and even with Labor's right wing these Tory aristocrats could combine, but for Labor's left wing they are impossible allies. Yet it is the Left that leads the movement for a People's Front. Your correspondent inclines to the belief that before this year ends some steps towards a united Opposition may be taken, but he dare not risk a detailed forecast.

London H. N. BRAILSFORD

The Catholic Church in Politics

VI: *Catholics in a Democracy*

Must catholics in the United States conform of necessity to the dictatorial acts and policies of the hierarchy in social and political matters? They constitute a bloc of twenty-odd millions of our population—about one-sixth of the entire nation. Controlled as they are at present by a highly centralized authority directed by the Vatican in Fascist Italy, their influence can be used with a force much in excess of what this mere percentage would otherwise warrant in any question of vital importance to the future of American life. Facts prove that the intransigent policies of the hierarchy, not the collective will of the people as Americans, have so far always triumphed. "My religion from Rome, my politics from home" has been the proud boast of many well intentioned lay Catholics. But the opinion of the individual Catholic, as an individual, in the many matters mentioned in the preceding articles of this series, has had little or no effect on the public conduct of Catholicism as a whole in American life. In the words of Father Jones I. Corrigan, "It isn't any individual layman that can speak for the Church . . . the only ones who are able officially to represent Catholic truth and the Catholic Church are the Bishops of the Church."

The point of serious concern to Catholics and non-Catholics alike is the fact that officials of the Catholic Church in America, who are able to block needed social legislation and to change state constitutions, are not the elected representatives even of their own people. Pastors of large congregations are appointed and transferred at the behest of their bishops. The bishops themselves are appointed arbitrarily and directly by the Pope. The million Catholics of the Archdiocese of New York, for instance, have not the slightest idea as to who the successor to Cardinal Hayes will be, nor will they have any voice in his appointment. Yet, in conjunction with other members of the hierarchy, he will be able to influence legislation at Albany for all citizens of the state. Furthermore, the successor of the present ailing Pontiff, who will instruct the bishops of America in matters of vital concern to the future of democracy, will undoubtedly have to be Fascist-minded to please Mussolini.

We can hardly believe, however, that the mass of Catholic lay people want to be convinced, as they are taught in their catechism of Christian Doctrine, that the liberalism of modern democracy is to be condemned because "it is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and of worship, on liberty of speech and of the press." Alfred E. Smith, perhaps the most representative lay Catholic in this country, publicly repudiated this teaching when campaigning for the presidency in 1928, and by so doing rejoiced many of his fellow Catholics and reassured many doubting non-Catholics. In a country where their own freedom to worship, speak and live

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

freely depends upon the same guarantee's being extended to all alike, it would not be expected that Catholics, any more than others, would willingly and consciously act in support of principles so nearly identical with those which we have come to term fascist. But if not consciously and willingly, then blindly and unquestioningly, the Catholic population of this country has been led to give weight to the increasing pressure of their Church authorities in favor of such dictatorial methods and principles.

It would be lamentable, and very serious for all of us, were it impossible for Catholics in America to resist this pressure imposed upon them from above by the reactionary leadership now in control of their Church. If so far they have failed to do so, it can only be because they have never been afforded the opportunity to know and consider any other kind of leadership. They are instructed to declare in favor of fascism in Spain and to condemn the Loyalists—and most of them do so without question. They are forbidden by their priests to view motion pictures such as "Blockade," even though they would be unable to discover anything wrong with them unless they were told so. The majority not only shun such pictures themselves, but picket theatres in obedience to orders from their priests in order to prevent others from seeing them. The same majority dutifully accept orders from the pulpits of their churches during mass on Sundays to vote for certain candidates for public office and for certain amendments to their state constitutions, and sign pledge cards against ratification of the Child Labor Amendment. They assemble to cheer Hagueism in Jersey City at the call of their pastors. John Longo, an earnest Catholic boy and secretary of the Holy Name Society in his parish, resisted Mayor Hague and was expelled from the Holy Name Society. They took him back, but made no effort to save him from the cruel sentence which he is still serving in a Jersey jail. Many Catholics fear to join CIO unions just because they are told that such unions are not the kind advocated in the Pope's encyclical. They become veritable heresy-hunters after members of other sects. All they seem conscious of is what they are led to believe—that strict conformity in such matters is of the essence of Catholicism and intimately bound up with their eternal salvation in the life after death.

But just because Catholics in America have scarcely known any other kind of leadership or outlook which they may justifiably follow in political and social matters—just because they have had to follow the reactionary, die-hard faction that happens to be in control of their Church today—does this mean that no other type of leadership exists?

Roman Catholicism as first brought to America was the inquisitorial brand that flourished during the Spanish hegemony in Europe. The Spanish Dominicans (literally known within the Church as the *Domini canes*, "Hounds of the Lord") who followed Columbus were the chief heresy-hunters of the Catholic Church. Their inquisition actually functioned in Mexico till as recently as the year 1813. Later, the Catholicism that came to these shores in colonial days was the still more militant kind that had been enshrined in the severe decrees of the Council of Trent. Catholicism in Maryland was no exception. Maryland's so-called Act of Tolerance of 1649, credited to the Catholic Calverts, is a mere myth. It was really a most intolerant act, for it decreed death and confiscation of goods for all who would deny the Christian Trinity. Under it, Jews and Freethinkers were subject to far greater disabilities than are Jews and non-Aryans in Hitler's Third Reich. Armed with the intolerant Tridentine decrees, the Jesuits (who had railroaded them through the Council) set out to win back, at all costs and by all means, the supremacy of the papacy over the nations lost to the Church by the Reformation. They constituted themselves the watchdogs of an overlording papacy—"the Party" of worldwide Catholicism—and have always seen to it that popes are elected who will strictly enforce their determined principles and methods upon Catholics everywhere. They would even sacrifice a pope to save their idea of papacy.

To this dictatorial leadership of Catholicism is due the insistence upon the age-old claim that the Catholic Church is a "perfect society," superior to the civil state, which is the root cause of all the trouble with Catholicism in the United States, Mexico and Spain. The effect of this is so far-reaching that The Brooklyn Tablet (November 5, 1938), the official organ of the diocese of Brooklyn (the largest Catholic diocese in the world), boldly asserts that the Catholic Church, in this year 1938, has still the right to inflict capital punishment, the power of life and death over heretics:

> Heresy is an awful crime . . . and those who start a heresy are more guilty than they who are traitors to the civil government. If the state has the right to punish treason with death, the principle is the same that concedes to the spiritual authority the power over the arch-traitor to truth and Divine revelation. . . . A perfect society has the right to its existence . . . and to the defense against all enemies, internal as well as external. . . . And the power of capital punishment is acknowledged for a perfect society. Now . . . the [Catholic] Church is a perfect society, and as such it has the right and power to take means to safeguard its existence.

To make matters worse for the growth of a saner Catholic outlook in the United States, this ambitious Jesuit-Dominican element which first introduced Catholicism to America, became allied with another element whose ideology was equally severe, that is, the Jansenist Irish clergy who followed their people to this country in the great immigration waves of the eighteen hundreds. Until the recent death of Cardinal Hayes, three out of the four American Cardinals were of Irish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parentage. Nearly 60 percent of the archbishops and bishops of the United States are of Irish birth or Irish parentage; the percentage of Irish priests is still greater. The "bad" centers of democracy, New York, Boston, Jersey City, Kansas City, etc., have been politically controlled by this element of Catholicism.

All the principles of what is now styled fascism have been strenuously fought for by this arbitrary Jesuit leadership. Long antedating Mussolini and Hitler, it has always been professedly anti-liberal, anti-secular, anti-Masonic, anti-Semitic. To it must be credited the anti-liberal enactments of the Syllabus of Errors of Pope Pius IX and the anti-democratic principles laid down by Pope Leo XIII in his "Christian Constitution of States." It was this faction which insisted upon the decree of personal infallibility of the Pope—the First Dogmatic Constitution of the Christian Church. It has led the fight against the secularization of public education, marriage and government. It is in the van in the crusade against birth control and the Child Labor Amendment. Finally to this Jesuit faction must be credited the solemn tie-up of the Vatican with Mussolini's fascism in 1929, which was engineered by the Jesuit Father Tacchi Venturi against the better judgment of the more liberal clergy in Rome itself. The writer had personal experience of the fear of Mussolini by the liberal prelates and clergy when his Black Shirts descended on Rome. In 1928, when he was in Rome on legal business with the Vatican, liberal prelates expressed to him their well grounded fears of the coup which the all-powerful Jesuit faction was about to perpetrate the following year. Without the backing which the Treaty of the Lateran between the Pope and Mussolini gave to fascism, its cruel victories in Ethiopia, Spain and China, culminating in Munich, would not have been easy.

Many bishops in the United States fear this dictatorial control of the Jesuits. Though at times they protest against it, they feel themselves powerless to counteract it. At one time or another this Jesuit faction has been expelled from every country in Europe. It was once irrevocably expelled from the Catholic Church itself.[1] One of the first acts considered necessary by the Spanish Republican regime in 1931 was to chase the Jesuits out of the country after King Alfonso. And one of the first acts of General Franco was to bring them back again. Fascist Spain is now their happy hunting ground, where they confidently expect to be able to carry out their principles to the full. Cardinal Goma, Primate of Spain, speaks for them when he says: "The war must be ended without compromise or reconciliation. . . . It is necessary to extirpate all the putrefaction of lay legislature. . . . We are in complete agreement with the Nationalist Government, which, on the other hand, never takes a step without consulting me and obeying me."

[1] Significantly, by a Franciscan Pope, *cf. infra.*

The same can be said for the answer by an Insurgent General to a Protestant minister who asked for permission to reopen his chapel: "I don't see the necessity for it and there will soon be in Spain neither Protestants nor Jews nor Freemasons."

Besides this Jesuit controlling faction, however, there exist in Catholicism two others with entirely different outlooks. One is its opposite extreme—the Franciscan. Its aim is purely "other worldly." It cares little for an overlording papacy and apotheosizes poverty, urging it upon all from Pope to peasant; it is totally unconcerned about any social and economic uplift of humanity. Although this spirit of St. Francis of Assisi has also been ecclesiasticized to a great extent, the Franciscan faction in Catholicism still retains and works for its aim to create a great brotherhood of the poor by reducing all to the common level of poverty in the matter of this world's goods. It is concerned only with matters of the soul and the life beyond the grave.

But midway between these two extremes is the third —the Benedictine—outlook on Catholic life. It long antedates the other two. It rejects both the ambitious schemes of the Jesuits for an overlording papacy and the poverty-loving teachings of the Franciscans. It had its origin in France, and to its influence the more liberal attitude of French Catholicism in social and political matters is due. France never fully accepted papal supremacy, and even the enactment of Papal Infallibility in 1870 did not entirely wipe out the traditional claims to independence from Rome of the Gallican Church. French Catholics may take their religion from Rome, but they lightly sidestep Rome's jurisdiction in politics, religion and social affairs. The French Catholics, even some members of the hierarchy, do not, for instance, condemn the Loyalists in Spain as unquestioningly as do most of their fellow religionists in the United States.

The Benedictine tradition is all for the dignity of labor. Its ancient motto, in fact, is *Laborare Est Orare*, "To work is to pray." They were the architects and builders of pre-Reformation Europe. They were of and with the common people, and taught them how to plow, to build and to make books. Their monasteries mirrored the community around them and were not useless, lifeless enclosures but public workshops, centers of industry. The democratic conduct of their monasteries, elections to office and treatment of delinquents set the example for government in public life. To them may be partly traced the free, industrious spirit of the French people and their revolt against the higher clergy. The prime concern of the French people as a whole for work and social uplift, their light-hearted unconcern, on the other hand, for the spiritual thunderings of the Vatican in contrast to the gloomy and fearful attitude taken by Catholics in America, are due in some degree to the opportunity afforded them to know of other views of Catholic life than that foisted solely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon Catholicism in America during the comparatively short period of its existence.

The United States has known little or nothing of this more democratic outlook of the Benedictine tradition, nor has any opportunity been afforded it to assume leadership here. There are very few Benedictine houses in the United States compared to the vast number of Jesuit and Dominican establishments, and none of them has been able to function as in Europe.

With or without the Benedictines, however, Catholics in America will have to resurrect something of the spirit of their more democratic leadership if they wish to be regarded as a help in keeping this country inoculated against the intolerant authoritarian spirit rapidly spreading in the world today. They will have to give less heed to the claim of superior legal entity for the Catholic Church over the civil state, less also to suppressing the Quins' diapers in the movies and Mae West on the radio, and instructing Catholic and non-Catholic laymen as to how they should conduct their marital relations. Instead they will have to seek and follow a Catholic leadership which is more in keeping with the advancing social consciousness of the American people and its traditional love of freedom and liberty.

There are signs that consciousness of this need is being awakened in the Catholic masses. At least one bishop (safely marooned in Texas) has recently demanded the right for Catholic workingmen to join unions of their own choosing. Many leaders of CIO unions report that priests have gone out of their way to call upon their doubting parishioners and assure them that they may join such unions without hurt to their eternal salvation. The new editorial board which supplanted Michael Williams on The Commonweal has at least been able to insist upon a neutral policy for Catholics in the Spanish civil war. Some priests and representative Catholic laymen have attempted organized efforts to offset reactionary Catholic policies in face of rebuff from their autocratic leadership. The Catholic Worker, a lay organ, has bravely opposed many of the hierarchy's reactionary acts in the field of labor, though its ineffectiveness can be judged by the fact that it has not merited the censure of Church officials. Jerry O'Connell made a brave fight against Mayor Hague and the Catholic cohorts who backed him in Jersey City, although, as predicted, he suffered for it in the recent November elections. Catholic parishioners have gone so far as to picket in protest against the autocratic transfer of their priest, and Catholic children in Staten Island have been reported as picketing in favor of a priest whom they wished to retain as their pastor and school supervisor. Even the Pope is reported as less severe and more human since his illness: "Now," he told the Cardinal, "he understands many things more clearly because of his own suffering and he feels he is much wiser."

More significant is the sudden change of Catholic educators at their chief university in Washington, D. C., led by its liberal-minded rector, Mgr. Joseph M. Corrigan. Emphasis is now to be placed on social matters. Seventy bishops cabled the Pope from Washington on October 12 to assure him, in answer to his request, that they would make it their special business to institute intensive training courses in loyal citizenship and democratic principles. It is true that they qualified this by adding that this teaching would be in accord with the Catholic viewpoint. "We are today commissioning Your Holiness's pontifical university in America to proceed at once with the preparation of suitable courses of studies in the true principles of Catholic civics, economics and sociology; clearly and precisely defining both democracy in the light of Catholic truth and tradition, and also the rights and duties of the individual citizen in a representative republic." If this means that they will continue to yield to the intransigent element which has so far ruled them, little good will be accomplished. But if it will be done under a leadership that will make Catholicism here, as in France, earnest in caring for the common welfare, and less concerned about the details of birth control, marital relations, movie and radio censorship and the like, then American Catholics may indeed rejoice and non-Catholics relax their suspicions that the Church is not willing to coöperate in the preservation of the free institutions of American democracy.

LEO H. LEHMANN

This is the final article in the series on "The Catholic Church in Politics." — THE EDITORS

John Donne's Statue

He threw the shroud about his head
And bade the potent sculptor come:
Present me to proud Death, he said,
As one long known and overcome;
Admit beneath these cerements
Abhorrent Death to every sense.
I shall stand upright on the tomb!

Proud Donne was one did not believe
In heirs presumptive to a bone,
Or boys' pursuit of love with leave
To sensual oblivion.
Come, dying then! Too fine a joy
And too intrinsic for a boy:
Prolong that ecstasy in stone!

How strangely now that figure stirs!
Between the shroud a smile appears
Distracting all the sepulchres
Drowsed in their dust three hundred years.
In death his disillusion
Is made as sensual as the sun
Where laurel its green summer wears.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

"Your Face Is Familiar"

IT SEEMS CERTAIN that the next Congress will be much concerned with the problem of old-age security. Many thumping promises have been made by candidates who cannot possibly carry them through. That was not their intention in the first place. Few elections have seen pledges for this and that showered with the same lavishness which obtained this year. Dozens of men got themselves elected to the House by promising to reduce taxes and balance the budget and at the same time assure everyone over fifty or sixty some handsome stipend every month.

The price tags on the pension promises are sure to be marked down. Dr. Townsend used to stand upon the slogan of, "The plan, the whole plan and nothing but the plan." But in the last year or so the old gentleman has learned much of the art of horse-trading and he and Senator Lodge have settled on a much lower figure than that contained in the original prospectus. In spite of much wild economic thinking which has been pumped into the picture, I think it is all to the good that Congress should have to face and solve the problem of making security actually live up to the meaning of that word. Discussion of details should be left to men who can do more with figures than this humble layman.

The thing which concerns me at the moment is something even more intangible. I am wondering whether an increase in financial security will also bring with it some cessation of the fierce competition which assails the craftsman in America. It may even touch some of the artists. Possibly a novelist of note can sit back for several years and allow an idea to germinate before he puts it into a book. But the run-of-the-mine author must run on schedule like the trains in Italy. I'm not speaking simply of financial needs but of our national tendency to say to the person who has stepped out of the room for a little while, "Your face is familiar, but I can't seem to place you."

Journalists in particular are criticized for turning out such a vast quantity of helter-skelter material. Very little comes from them which has been aged in the wood. But they have a right to say that the conditions imposed by the craft demand it. I think it might be an excellent idea for a publisher to say to a daily columnist, "On those days when you have nothing to say, don't say it." The reader could be educated to accept a brief note reading "Mr. Jones has decided to sit this one out for the good of his soul." But it is not yet a familiar custom and when a columnist fails to appear in his usual spot there is a feeling that he is either off on a binge or a rebellion. And unfortunately the first choice is the one that comes most readily to the mind of the reader.

An out-of-town newspaperman well known to me had run a department in a paper for something more than twenty years. At long last he decided to take a year off. He was one of the thrifty kind. Earnestly I advised him against any such indulgence. "Nobody will remember you when you get back on the job," I told him. He replied haughtily that he felt that twenty years of hard and honest and not untalented toil had put him in a position to command a following of the faithful who liked his stuff. He did not take my advice and lived to regret it. After a lapse of a year he had to start all over again. Even his friends said that he wasn't what he used to be. The vacation had invigorated him and he tried to do his daily stint in a fresh and novel manner. That was taken as an evidence of retrogression and advancing age and after an unhappy six months he retired to a previously prepared farm in the country.

It so happened that I knew what I was talking about. Upon very many occasions kind friends have come to me and said, "I hope you won't be offended if I tell you the truth." Upon such occasions I say mendaciously that at any hour of the day or night I am always receptive to both terseness and accuracy, and particularly accuracy. And naturally I get my hands up and try to hide my jaw behind my right shoulder.

"It's just this," the kind friend continues. "A little group of us were talking about you and your work the other day. We all agreed that you were a swell baseball writer twenty-five years ago on the old Tribune. But something of that old zip seems to be gone. It may be that you are growing older. We were wondering if you couldn't take your vacation just about now and also take an additional two months' leave of absence. After that you might come back almost as good as new."

Always I have made it a rule to thank the well wisher with the utmost cordiality and reply, "I think that's very sound advice. I won't do that."

Even the worst stuff a journeyman turns out does not hurt him so much as doing nothing at all. Some day there should be a play or a verse or maybe only an essay on the plight of the galley slaves of the daily columns. Much has been made of the fact that old troupers in the theatre say, "The show must go on," with which each bravely walks upon the stage with a broken heart or laryngitis. But even a successful show hardly goes on for much more than a season. I could name at least half a dozen men in my own fraternity who have turned their copy in every day hot or cold for twenty years or more.

I am not presenting this as an example of some supreme sacrifice upon their part. They have been motivated and actuated by pure self-interest. There is a thing in newspaper work called momentum. The successful practitioner in the public prints hopes to get himself established in somewhat the same manner as a breakfast food. If he fails to turn up each morning with the orange juice the client is all too likely to quit him and try farina.

And so, again, I express the timid and the pious hope that as security for the aged develops along legislative lines there may be an attendant easing off the pace along the assembly line. There could be a world in which the considerate would say, "Oh, let the old boy sit down for a second and draw himself for once a good long breath."

If and when that good day comes I shall be rid of a nightmare that has haunted me for a quarter of a century. In the dream I have just fifteen minutes in which to do the column and I am unfortunately way up in front of the Columbia campus wearing nothing but a pajama top. Freudians may make whatever they please out of that, but it is my notion that the dream means I want security.

HEYWOOD BROUN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Help Wanted in Congress

SUPPOSEDLY AUTHENTIC REPORTS about Mr. Roosevelt's intentions are always subject to heavy discount for error; nevertheless, excellent sources say that the vacancy on the Supreme Court created by the death of Mr. Justice Cardozo was a few days ago definitely offered to Mr. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, forthright, imperturbable, carrot-topped Senator from the state of Washington. He is the candidate for whom pro-labor groups around the President have been agitating ever since the vacancy occurred.

However, since the offer was made by Mr. Roosevelt, it is reported that qualms have arisen in the minds of Mr. Schwellenbach's friends, and perhaps even in that of the Senator himself. In the last few months, three particularly aggressive New Dealers in the Senate have suffered sharply in prestige. Mr. Minton of Indiana finds himself uncomfortably lashed to the tail of Mr. McNutt's presidential rocket; Mr. Smathers of New Jersey has boss-hague trouble, and Mr. Green's Rhode Island has surrendered itself to a Vanderbilt. By general agreement, Senator Schwellenbach is now the administration's ablest defender in the Senate. It is hard for New Dealers to decide whether he is more needed there, or on the Supreme Court bench.

The outstanding possibility for the Court, of course, is Professor Frankfurter. There is no doubt he would have been named long ago except for a feeling among presidential advisers that the Court is already overweighted with Justices from the Atlantic seaboard. The mere fact that Mr. Schwellenbach is from Seattle is a heavy argument in his favor. Accordingly, an unspoken understanding has sprung up that Professor Frankfurter would be named to the first vacancy made by the retirement of an Eastern-state Justice. Lately there has been a flood of newspaper stories saying that Mr. Justice Brandeis, because of his great desire to aid in the organization of the Jewish community against Fascist persecution, might soon indicate his withdrawal. However, men who have been working closely with Mr. Brandeis say he has given no evidence of retiring.

One of the great difficulties New Dealers have had to face has been the fact that the key committees of the House have been stacked against them. After the administration defeats in the House last spring, it was agreed by New Dealers that a great effort should be made in the coming Congress to see that genuine liberals obtained fat committee assignments. The time to act has now arrived. The Southerners are making up quiet lists, haggling and bartering with individual members, and the White House advisers are not lifting a finger to oppose them.

Probably the chairmanship of the Rules Committee will go to Mr. Sabath of Illinois, America's most distinguished Czech, although a few Representatives complain vaguely that a younger man should be chosen. Pro-labor groups are working unostentatiously to have Mr. Ramspeck of Georgia named to one of the three Rules Committee vacancies. Mr. Ramspeck is not exactly a fighter on the barricades, yet the compromise wages-and-hours bill that was worked out a year ago between him and Mr. John L. Lewis was an excellent measure. Had it been adopted by the administration, it would have slid through the House without the flare-up of ill will and recrimination that later occurred. However, a Georgia man, Mr. Eugene E. Cox, already sits on the Rules Committee, and it is feared that other state delegations may object to Georgia's having two committee members. This is doubly unfortunate, since Mr. Cox is one of the wildest CIO-baiters in the House.

Mr. Roosevelt's great national-defense program has now passed the trial-balloon stage, and is to be the theme, in world's-fair language, of the next session. As in the case of Mr. Roosevelt's earlier political maneuvers, it is subject to change on twenty-four hours' notice. But at least the principal White House advisers are working like a stoke-hold crew drafting a program, and young assistants are crawling over the administrative departments seeking national-defense "angles." Mr. Roosevelt's speech on the state of the nation to be delivered in person before the new Congress, it is predicted, will concern national defense; the budget will be a national-defense budget, although Mr. Roosevelt promises no special taxes. Great efforts are being made to incorporate relief and public works in the program—so far without noticeable success. Whatever else may be achieved, the airplane manufacturers are doing nicely. Airplane stocks have doubled, in some cases tripled, since last summer. Three years ago, during the Senate munitions investigation, these same manufacturers were merchants of death. A few days ago Mr. Roosevelt took occasion to defend the industry as the equal of any in the world.

A consequence of the defense-solidarity program has been a visible breach between Secretary of War Woodring and his chief aide, Assistant Secretary Johnson. M-day has been Mr. Johnson's meat. He presided over the meeting of public-utility executives here a month ago, at which the power industry was mobilized for war. Ten thousand factories stand ready to leap into munitions-making at the drop of Mr. Johnson's hat. Amid such a flurry of newspaper handouts as Washington has seldom seen, he is now arranging to distribute the War Department's "educational" orders to industry.

Throughout this excitement, Mr. Woodring's name has scarcely been mentioned. This neglect appears to go back to the fact that, by prescriptive right, the secretaryship of War belongs to the American Legion. After Mr. Dern's sudden death, the Legion bosses had difficulty in deciding to whom the plum should go. While they wrangled among themselves, Mr. Roosevelt advanced Mr. Woodring, allegedly temporarily, from the assistant secretaryship to the top job. This shocked the Legion bosses, and they hastily put forward Mr. Johnson as their candidate.

Mr. Woodring is an estimable person, former Governor of Kansas and son-in-law of the late Senator Coolidge of Massachusetts. Unhappily, in Legion politics he is a small shot, being no more than a past commander of West Virginia. Mr. Johnson, on the other hand, is a very big Legionnaire shot, indeed. He was national commander in 1932-33, the critical period in which Messrs. Roosevelt and Farley were frantically seeking primary votes. It was understood, at least by the Legion, that Mr. Johnson would be obliged

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to serve only briefly as assistant secretary, after which Mr. Woodring would retire and Mr. Johnson succeed him. So far, Mr. Woodring gives no sign of budging.

Washington T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Holding-Company Banking

THE TRANSAMERICA CORPORATION OF CALIFORNIA—saturated though it is with New Deal loyalties and connections—has run afoul of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the redoubtable William O. Douglas.

The Transamerica Corporation is that enormous banking octopus which bestrides California and has managed to advance its interests in all administrations with a gay and effective political versatility.

Back in the days of Herbert Hoover, himself a Californian, the Transamerica institutions got into difficult waters, as did so many financial institutions. It managed to get, without so much as a whisper of publicity, a hundred-million-dollar loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Charles Dawes's bank in Chicago got ninety millions, but Dawes was not able to keep it quiet. Giannini, however, master-mind of the Transamerica, did better than the Vice President by ten millions and kept the transaction completely dark, even to high government officials and Senate leaders. Think that over—a hundred-million-dollar loan by the government to a private institution and in complete secrecy. It was not known until this writer discovered it and published it in connection with other RFC loans in 1932.

Later Mr. Hoover was defeated and presently Mr. Giannini turned up as the most vocal defender of the New Deal. William Gibbs McAdoo appeared as a powerful friend at court. The banks were under attack, under investigation by Ferdinand Pecora. But the only banking legislation brought forward to deal with the banks originated with Carter Glass and he had literally to sneak his Glass-Steagall bill over without any aid, indeed with some unfriendliness from the White House. That bill dissolved affiliates. But it did not dissolve holding companies. The holding-company bankers were, although in disgrace, still powerful enough to prevent Congress from doing anything very serious about them. The Glass-Steagall bill did, however, subject holding companies owning banks to bank examination. That was some advance. But it was little enough when one considers that the only sound thing to do with holding-company banking structures is to end them.

All during the present regime the Transamerica Corporation, largest of the bank holding companies, has coasted along surprisingly favored by the powers-that-be. But this was rudely interrupted when W. O. Douglas became head of the SEC. An investigation of investment trusts was under way. Questionnaires were sent to all investment trusts by David Schenker, who was making the investigation for Douglas. One investment trust belonged to the Transamerica Corporation. But the Transamerica thought it did not have to answer such a request. It had powerful friends in Washington. But they availed not and so the answer was forced. Then accountants were sent to look over the investment trust. But the first thing they found in their path was a fact which has always been known about anything connected with a holding-company banking structure. You cannot investigate a bank belonging to such an outfit without examining all the other banks and, as well, all the miscellaneous other properties.

And so Schenker found himself up against the stone wall of a complicated holding-company structure. He had no right to examine Mr. Giannini's banks, so he realized it was futile to attempt to investigate his investment trust. So the SEC reported the matter to Eccles and J. F. T. O'Connor, then Comptroller of the Currency. But Eccles has a holding system of his own and O'Connor was a McAdoo protegé and was about to be a candidate for Governor of California. So nothing was done, although it is reported Eccles protested against the investigation. But Douglas, apparently, proposes to drive ahead. It will involve the whole question of holding-company banking.

The Transamerica has undergone some reorganization arrangements in the last few years. But the structure is one to excite the apprehension of those who are now disturbed by the promise of a reactionary wave. There is, of course, no question of the solvency of these banks. It is a matter of financial and economic policy.

The Transamerica is a huge holding company which controls one banking system with assets of a billion and a half—the Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association. It has 491 branches in 306 communities in California and added 25 to its string in 1937. This is a branch-banking system, and within limitations is not, in itself, objectionable. But the Transamerica which owns this huge bank also controls all sorts of other corporations. It owns another holding company—the Transamerica General—which in turn owns various other corporations. For instance, it owns the stock of the Occidental Life Insurance Company, the American and Securities Corporation, an investment trust, the Bancamerica Agricultural Credit Corporation and the California Joint Stock Land Bank. It also owns California Lands, Inc. This concern has 500,000 acres of California land spread all over the state and running into all sorts of mineral and agricultural interests. It has been drilling for oil and is operating some wells.

It owns what is called the Capital Company, which owns and operates apartment buildings, office buildings, residential buildings all over California. The Transamerica is, of course, in all sorts of other things as well. But it owns bank stocks in other states. For instance, it owns 532,000 shares of the National City Bank in New York. It is the largest stockholder in that bank. It owns stocks in Portland and Seattle banks and in Nevada banks. It owns 213,000 shares in Bancamerica Blair Corporation. It is in every sort of business from wild-catting to banking. The master holding company is the Transamerica Corporation. The Bank of America is merely a department of that business.

If the Transamerica Corporation is permitted to do this there is no reason why anyone else ought to be prevented from doing it. Yet no possible excuse can be imagined for such a structure. The branch-banking system may be all right. It has great advantages and within limits should be encouraged. But holding-company banking is something else and should be stopped. JOHN T. FLYNN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Frankness has been the chief characteristic of Italian and German diplomacy. An unequivocal statement that Germany has no political ambitions in the Western Hemisphere would in all probability end the dangerous growling [of the United States]. – *Constantin Brown, writing in The Washington Star.*

Mr. Forbes said that, on a trip to Spain last January, he had quite a talk with Franco and, outside of the presence of soldiers in large numbers, there was no indication that a civil war was being waged in that country. – *W. Cameron Forbes, former Governor-General of the Philippine Islands and Ambassador to Japan, quoted in The Boston Post.*

Mrs. Flanagan, whose long career in the theatre was read into the record by Mrs. Woodward, was asked by Representative Starnes of Alabama to describe this "Communist Marlowe" to whom she had referred in a magazine article.

"I am sorry, but I was quoting from Christopher Marlowe," she said. "Put it in the record that he was a great dramatist in the period of Shakespeare." – *From a news item in The New York Times.*

The Old College Try

"The spirit of sportsmanship in athletic contests throughout the rest of the world is unfit for Japan," according to Education Minister Sadao Araki. In baseball games, the Nichi Nichi says: "The Japanese spirit is to be emphasized in the next spring series. Bats, balls and gloves must be handled with loving care, such as a samurai would expend upon his sword. . . . All games must be played with the solemnity of two swordsmen battling for their lives." – *From a news item in Asia Magazine.*

It Can't Happen Here

Our screen is a free medium, and we must keep it free. Today there is no event in history and no incident in modern life that cannot be shown on the screen. – *Will Hays, in a speech at The New York Herald Tribune Forum, reported in that paper.*

Leather-Medal Department

An overseas telephone call was the prize in a sales contest which the Underwood Elliott Fisher Company, manufacturers of business machines, recently held for its branch managers. The company announced that the first three branch managers to make a monthly quota would be given the privilege of telephoning M. S. Eylar, vice-president of the company who was traveling in Europe, and personally informing him of their records. – *From Long Lines, an employee magazine of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

The Catholic Church in Politics

SIR: It is not my intention to engage in a controversy about the Catholic Church. There has been a vast battle of books on that subject and still the war goes on. My position is not that of a Catholic apologist. Such a position I could neither hold nor defend. I write, not to register any protest against the general content of Dr. L. H. Lehmann's series of articles, but to extend the scope of a most superficial inquiry.

It would be unfair to ask of Dr. Lehmann that he bring the whole political history of the Church both Catholic and Reformist to bear upon his examination. It is not unfair, however, to suggest that an awareness of that history might give an illumination to Dr. Lehmann's articles that they do not now have. It might also demand an answer to the most important question raised by the Doctor's examination—a question which, though he poses it, seems to escape his attention entirely. "What has been the response of individual Catholics to the political activity of their Church?" A large historical survey would not be necessary. Dr. Lehmann need look no further than contemporary Spain. There he might find evidence that Catholics do not always follow their leaders to reaction as they follow the bells to mass.

There are 20,000,000 or more Catholics in the United States. The tone of Dr. Lehmann's thesis would lead the readers to believe that these millions of citizens, in every rank and class of life, were joining with their Bishops and Archbishops in a dark plot against our American liberties and institutions. This, I insist—and so, in all human decency, Dr. Lehmann should have insisted—is not true. You will find, among Catholics, the same political divisions you will find among the members of any other church: which, being little enough, should have been said.

It makes no difference, I submit, that The New Republic expressed its editorial belief that there were many thousands of Catholics who disapprove of the political actions of some members of their faith. If Dr. Lehmann now repeats this as his own personal opinion it would still make no difference. The human tolerance to be gained from an awareness of this simple fact should have infused his essays from the beginning. It is well to expose the unpatriotic activities of a group of churchmen. It is damnable, in so doing, to direct anger and animosity against a large group of Americans who cannot always make themselves heard. The fires of religious prejudice have singed this country often enough.

I wish to avoid, because of the problems of time and space, any discussion of the metaphysics of Catholicism. I would like, however, to refer Dr. Lehmann to the latest work of the Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain. It is called "True Humanism" and was noticed, far too briefly, in a recent issue of The New Republic (November 30, 1938). I share but few of M. Maritain's views. When he says, however, that the spiritual content of Christianity must always be considered distinct from the temporal manifestations of Christendom, including the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholic Church, I believe he is saying something most important to this discussion.
Beaufort, S. C. HAMILTON BASSO

SIR: Your articles on the Catholic Church are great. But, you are incredibly stuffy and arty. . . .
New York City HOMER J. WINKLE

SIR: Accept my congratulations on your courage. . . . Not the least [problem] has been the increase of property holdings by the Church which has steadily, in this Hudson Valley, withdrawn valuable land from taxation, with a resulting heavier burden upon all taxpayers including, of course, those who believe that the teachings and attitudes of the Church today are fundamentally opposed to social progress. . . .
Cornwall, N. Y. ETHEL BURNS BREED

SIR: . . . For many years I have watched, with alarm, the growth of Catholic domination over the curricula in our tax-supported free public schools—especially the elementary school. In talking with some of our university people, they have acknowledged this to be a fact, but there was and is complete silence. . . . I am grateful for your courage.
Chicago, Ill. MRS. HARVEY AINSWORTH TYLER

SIR: I regret, as probably many thousands do, "The Catholic Church in Politics." . . .You ask that there be no offense taken by Catholics in general. That would be impossible since this article is malicious. . . . If you only knew Catholic doctrine. Catholics are only obliged to obey the Church hierarchy in matters of "Faith and Morals," not politics.
Newark, N. J. IRENA T. DEVORE

SIR: I must write and express my deep appreciation of the fact that you are publishing such articles as those of Dr. Lehmann. It is highly gratifying to know that we have at least one big national magazine that is intelligent and brave enough to tell the truth about the subversive activities of the Church. . . .
Washington, D. C. SIVERT ERDAHL

SIR: . . . I would welcome more ardently your criticism if, even by accident, I ever found in The New Republic a sympathetic note on the Catholic Church. It is always damned at a venture. This attitude is quite intelligible. Still there is the realm of good taste. Just now it seems wholly inopportune to stir up strife here. . . .
Chicago, Ill. RIGHT REV. THOMAS J. SHANNON

SIR: Allow me to commend you on your intelligent and courageous articles on the obnoxious meddling of the Catholic Church in the life of the people of America. If there were more magazines writing such articles, there would be less need for them.
New York City BABETTE ROTHBERG

SIR: Another ex-priest seems to have turned up in left-wing periodicals. . . . The first of his articles suggests that the series is going to be but a rehash of every painfully developed "issue" involving Catholics that has arisen in recent years. The same technique is being used too—that of identifying certain acts or expressions of persons labeled Catholic with official Catholic Church policy. I suppose it inadvisable, however, for The New Republic to deviate from party line on more than one issue.
Kalamazoo, Mich. DR. J. J. BURNS

Partisan Review Finale

SIR: "Lick 'em or join 'em!" is a classic political maxim. Having failed signally to lick Partisan Review, Malcolm Cowley now stretches out a friendly hand and invites us "to forget these quarrels" and "work together for the human aims that most of us share." (Only a few weeks earlier, he was suggesting we are fascists!) We don't feel we share the aims of Mr. Cowley and his political associates, we have not been impressed by his clumsy efforts first to smear us and now to conciliate us, and we must therefore regretfully continue in our heretical attitude.
THE EDITORS OF PARTISAN REVIEW
New York City

[Let's get the record straight, even if takes a little more of our limited space. I didn't say that the editors of Partisan Review were fascists. What I did say, referring to their August-September issue, was that if you put a green cover on it you could hardly tell it from The American Mercury. That is true for two reasons—first, because both magazines are chiefly devoted to attacking Russia and the Communists; second, because many of the Partisans write in the same bright, sneering style that one associates with The Mercury. But my statement had to do with effects and not intentions. The editors of Partisan Review assure us that their intentions are purely revolutionary—and I shouldn't think of contradicting them. It is useless to argue about motives.

As for the invitation to "forget these quarrels about the international communist movement . . . and work together for the human aims that most of us share," it wasn't addressed to the editors of Partisan Review. It was addressed to all the writers who want to continue living and working in a free society.—M. C.]

Mr. Flynn and the Party Line

SIR: Our attention has been called to the article by John T. Flynn in The New Republic of November 2, 1938. We marvel that the editors published without any comment Mr. Flynn's complete distortion of the Communist Party's position on how to keep this country out of war. Since you failed to point to Mr. Flynn's misstatement, will you allow us to make the necessary corrections in your correspondence column?

Mr. Flynn asserts: "There is one group on the left in this country which is violently for collective security and heavy argument. This is the Communist Party." While it is true that we are wholeheartedly for collective security (is any other security possible today?) it is absolutely untrue to say that we are for heavy armament. We have made our position publicly clear many a time, once even in The New Republic for February 2, 1938. During the election campaign we made this clear by Plank 9 of our National Congressional Program, which said in part: "We propose an American peace policy in line with President Roosevelt's October, 1937, speech to quarantine the war-makers, to promote concerted action with France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the other democratic peoples and governments of the world, in order to halt and isolate the fascist war-makers, to assist their victims and to guarantee world peace. *We oppose the expenditure of billions on armaments and war preparations as a substitute for concerted action for peace.*"

We have been unceasing in our attempts to convince the people that armaments are no substitute for a peace policy. We pointed out that the only way to keep this country out of war was to coöperate peacefully with other countries in quarantining the aggressors. Mr. Flynn admits the possibility of the success of such a policy when he says: "Did not the grim comedy of Berchtesgaden and Munich reveal in a blinding flash that Mussolini did not want war and has never wanted war? War would destroy him. He wants scares upon which he can flourish." It is, of course, this instability of the internal regimes of fascism in Germany and Italy that makes it possible for capitalist democracies, in coöperation with the Soviet Union, to make it impos-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sible for the Fascists to carry through their plans. In other words, it is the weakness of the democracies in realizing their strength that emboldens the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis and the Munich cabal to further their adventures in other people's lands.

In misstating our position, Mr. Flynn seeks to justify himself by saying that the Communist proposals for a foreign policy for our government serve "one great interest in Europe, and that is the preservation of the Russian experiment." It seems to us that it is not victorious socialism in the Soviet Union, defended by its mighty Red armed forces, that needs the defense of the United States. Quoting from Mr. Browder's article in the February 2 issue of The New Republic:

> At the present moment in world affairs, America needs the coöperation of the Soviet Union for her own protection from warlike aggression far more pressingly than the Soviet Union needs America for the same purpose. For the Soviet Union is fully prepared to defend itself, is fully united, and has just cleaned house of the last remnants of those who would coöperate with the enemy. But America, rich and full of potential booty, is still considered by the world to be in a pacifist funk, is torn by a constitutional crisis and sharp class struggles, and contains powerful forces that would welcome Japanese aggression for their own fascist ends. The record shows that the Soviet Union has been more than generous with moral, diplomatic, financial and material aid to Ethiopia, Spain, China, Austria and Czechoslovakia in their hours of crisis.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Flynn, for want of a peace program that will keep this country out of war, has to resort even to the lowest form of modern political activity, Red-baiting. For Red-baiting is exactly what Mr. Flynn is doing when he says that the fact that the American Student Union has abandoned the futile Oxford Oath "was the work of the Communist groups." Mr. Flynn will have to face the fact that millions of people, outside of the Communist Party, are beginning to realize the necessity of unifying all the forces of the world for the struggle against fascism.

We stand for lifting the embargo on Spain, the extension of our good-neighbor policy in Latin America, wheat and cotton loans to China and Spain, stopping trade with aggressor nations and fighting fascism at home. What is Mr. Flynn's position on *these* practical proposals?

ALAN HORTON,
State Educational Department of the Communist Party
New York City

SIR: In the article criticized I said there was one group on the Left in this country—the Communists—which wanted to preserve the Russian experiment and wanted to put the United States on that side. I added that its position is logical and easy to understand. I said also that the American Student Union's abandonment of the Oxford Oath was the work of the Communist groups. Certainly no one will deny these statements. I am surprised that the Communist Party should accuse me of Red-baiting because I made such simple and obviously true statements and made them, I believe, without any exhibition of rancor.

The other statement to which it objects is that the Communist Party is for collective security and heavy armaments. It concedes the former, but denies the latter. Surely it cannot be so lacking in realism as to favor collective security without the means of enforcing it. But it happens that Mr. Browder, whatever the Party may have said in 1937, has made its position clear now. As late as Sunday, November 27, in a Washington forum, he said that whatever he may have favored in the past, now he was for armaments in this country if they were to be used against fascism.

JOHN T. FLYNN
New York City

From The New Republic Mail Bag

N. H. Sauberman of the Bronx, New York, asks for more articles by Heywood Broun and less material from Max Lerner. On the other hand, James S. Hardy of Glens Falls, New York, thinks that instead of printing a column called "Shoot the Works," we should shoot Heywood Broun. . . . Sydney Justin Harris, editor of the Consolidated Book Publishers, Chicago, writing in connection with the Partisan Review debate that has been raging in our correspondence columns, says that "hollow name-calling has superseded honest, objective criticism and analysis between the Stalinists and the Trotskyites. . . . This internecine squabbling . . . gives fascism the arrogance and strength it possesses and . . . ultimately turns the lower and middle classes in disgust and bewilderment into the sweeping tide of reaction."

Hugo Pollock of the Fred Beal Defense Committee, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, urges New Republic readers to write notes of encouragement and Christmas greeting to Mr. Beal at the Caledonia Prison Farm, Halifax, North Carolina. . . . Vito Marcantonio, president of the International Labor Defense, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City, announces the Thirteenth Annual Christmas Drive for labor's neediest cases. The goal this year is a $25,000 fund to assure labor's prisoners, their families and the widows and orphans of labor's martyrs some measure of security and support for as long as they need it. This year the list of those who require help is enlarged by the political refugees from the Nazis' terror. . . . Paul Cravath, chairman of the National Emergency Committee of Christian Colleges in China, appeals for contributions to the fund for $330,000 which supports the thirteen colleges in China. Checks should be mailed to the Committee at 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

We have received from Charles W. Ervin, of New York City, a letter criticizing the reference to Louis Stark of The New York Times in the article, "The CIO Comes of Age," by Bruce Bliven Jr. in The New Republic of November 30. Mr. Ervin's letter is 900 words long and he insists that it be published in full. We shall print it as soon as we can make room for a communication which is by our standards of such great length.
— THE EDITORS

What's on the Air?

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of War Woodring, Sumner Welles, Dick Merrill and others speak to Americans residing outside the United States, Sunday, December 18, 8 P.M., Mutual.

Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and Professor William F. Ogburn of the Public Affairs Committee speak on the National Resources Committee's report on technology, Monday, December 19, 2:30 P.M., CBS.

Dr. Douglas Hyde, President of Eire, speaks on "Irish Culture," Thursday, December 22, 6:45 P.M., NBC-Red Network.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include "Mignon" by the Metropolitan Opera Company, Saturday, December 17, 1:55 P.M., NBC-Red Network; the New York Philharmonic, Sunday, December 18, 3 P.M., CBS; Bette Davis in the second episode of "Broken Pretense," by Grover Jones and True Boardman, Sunday, December 18, 6 P.M., CBS; Handel's "Messiah," by the Savannah Music Club chorus, Sunday, December 18, 11:30 P.M., CBS; Barnard College Christmas program, Tuesday, December 20, 12 noon, NBC-Blue Network; Arch Oboler's "Bread on the Waters," Thursday, December 22, 10 P.M., CBS; and Lionel Barrymore in Dickens' "A Christmas Carol," Friday, December 23, 9 P.M., CBS.

All times given are Eastern Standard Time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books That Changed Our Minds

WE DECIDED to print a series of articles dealing with the works of the last forty or fifty years that have contributed something new to American thinking—in other words, the books that changed our minds. But we had more than a little trouble deciding just which books should be included. And so, as I explained two weeks ago, I was commissioned to write to some of our friends for advice.

After describing the project and the difficulties involved in it, I asked, "What are the books in this category that have really impressed you and in some measure changed the direction of your own thought? So far the titles most frequently mentioned have been 'The Education of Henry Adams,' 'The Theory of the Leisure Class,' 'An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution,' 'Experience and Nature,' 'Main Currents of American Thought,' 'The Significance of Sections'—and among the European books, Sorel's 'Reflections on Violence,' Croce's 'Esthetics,' Spengler's 'Decline of the West,' Freud's 'Interpretation of Dreams,' Pareto's 'Mind and Society,' and perhaps one of the books by the 'new' scientists. But what are your suggestions?"

Eight of the answers were printed in our issue of December 7. Here are some of the others, together with the list of books that were finally chosen for revaluation.

Paul Weiss writes from the standpoint of the technical philosopher: "All the books on your list seem to me important, with the possible exception of Pareto's. This looks to me to be a purely literary choice, to which you could get very few sociologists, economists or philosophers to subscribe. Grant, against the evidence, that it is a good book; whose thinking has it modified? I have some doubts about 'The Education of Henry Adams' and the 'Main Currents,' though I cannot really qualify as a judge. And I doubt very much whether you have chosen the right book of Dewey. 'Experience and Nature' is his most important technical work, but so difficult and sluggish that I suspect that it has had very little influence. Dewey ought of course to be included, but I think you ought to choose his writings on education if you want him at his most influential, or perhaps his 'Human Nature and Conduct.' Your list seems to be overloaded on the economic-historical side and I am afraid emphasizes those books which have been most influential with or most discussed by literary rather than technical or speculative thinkers.

"Subject to recall without notice, here are my ten:

Veblen's Theory of the Leisure Class
James's Pragmatism
Dewey's Human Nature and Conduct (?)
Watson's Behaviorism
Freud's Interpretation of Dreams
Einstein's Relativity
Russell's Knowledge of the External World
Whitehead's Science and the Modern World
Spengler's Decline of the West
The Gestalt School—Wertheimer, Köhler, Koffka

"I think very little of some of these, but I have no doubt of their great influence in many domains. A list of the *best* books would be different."

Lewis Mumford says: "Your notion for a series of revaluations is excellent; and it ought to work out well. In addition to some of the books you mention I should add—with a sense that I have probably forgotten at the moment two or three of the most important books—the following:

Veblen: Theory of the Leisure Class
Whitehead: Science and the Modern World
Sombart: Moderne Kapitalismus
Bergson: Creative Evolution
Kropotkin: Fields, Factories and Workshops
Howard: The Garden City
Branford: Science and Society
Geddes and Thomson: Life

"The last volume is the only single book in which the major part of Geddes' ideas can be found. I should be tempted to substitute 'America's Coming of Age' for Parrington. I hope you do a series on fiction, too."

He adds a postscript that suggests an area of modern thinking somewhat neglected by the other correspondents. "P. S. None of the books on your present list recognizes the important *biologizing* of thought that's going on—except possibly Spengler."

Says Clifton Fadiman: "An interesting question. Probably none of the answers, including this one, will be honest. No one remembers what books really impressed one, or changed the direction of one's thought. Two forbidden pages out of some tawdry 'sex book,' read when one was eleven, may have had more influence on one than all the works by Freud. Also, one isn't influenced so much by specific books as by streams of tendency, popularized notions, rehashes of ideas. I suppose our generation has been more influenced by Marx than by any other single writer—yet very few of us, certainly not myself, have really read much Marx. Still, if you must have a list, here is mine:

Spengler's Decline of the West
The Prefaces and Plays of George Bernard Shaw
The early books of Van Wyck Brooks
V. I. Lenin's Imperialism
Freud generally
John Strachey's The Coming Struggle for Power
P. W. Bridgman's The Logic of Modern Physics
Sir Arthur Eddington's The Nature of the Physical World
The early books by H. L. Mencken
In a general way, all the biographies of scientists that I happen to have read in the last fifteen years—such a one as Vallery-Radot's "Pasteur," for example.

Says I. F. Stone, of The Nation and The New York Post: "The book that first got me started was Jack London's 'Martin Eden.' In its pages I obtained my first glimpse of the modern world of thought (I was twelve at the time) and because of it I read Herbert Spencer's 'First Principles' and learned about Darwinism. The next big step I remember was when at fourteen in a summer hotel I first discovered The New Republic and The Nation, back numbers of which were under the parlor table. Next poetry: first Carl Sandburg, then Milton's 'Paradise Lost' and 'Samson Agonistes,' then a Mermaid edition of Marlowe, *usw.*

"Aside from Emerson and Thoreau, whom I discovered early and loved, the first American work of non-fiction that I can remember as really marking a step forward in my

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellectual development was Beard's 'Economic Interpretation of the Constitution,' which I discovered in the Camden Public Library while I was a reporter on the old Courier. I was already, roughly speaking at least, a Marxist by that time (the eye-opener here was Kropotkin's 'Conquest of Bread,' whence I went on to Marx, Bukharin's 'Historical Materialism' and Engels) but this book made me realize the possibilities of American history and sociology. Louis Boudin's 'Government by Judiciary' was also an eye-opener for me, although I had already obtained a fair glimpse of the subject before I read it.

"Whitman and Emily Dickinson, as well as Emerson and Thoreau, and 'Moby Dick,' meant a great deal to me among the American writers but I can't think of any other American work of non-fiction that had the effect on me that Spencer and Kropotkin did. I must also mention Gissing's 'Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft,' which first gave me a peep at the joy to be found in Latin literature."

Newton Arvin sends a list of twenty books:

Principles of Literary Criticism: I. A. Richards
The Problem of Style: Remy de Gourmont
Human Nature and Conduct: John Dewey
The Life of Reason: George Santayana
Roads to Freedom: Bertrand Russell
The Philosophy of Physics: Max Planck
Epistle Dedicatory to "Man and Superman": Shaw
Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis: Freud
The Rise of American Civilization: C. A. Beard
Pragmatism: William James
Lectures on Behaviorism: John B. Watson
Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens
Letters and Leadership: Van Wyck Brooks
The Ordeal of Mark Twain: Van Wyck Brooks
The Great Society: Graham Wallas
Ten Days That Shook the World: John Reed
New Worlds for Old: H. G. Wells
The Science of Life: Wells and Huxley
Our America: Waldo Frank
The Mind in the Making: J. H. Robinson

"There is," Arvin says, explaining his standard of choice, "a difference between the particular books one realizes have actually impressed oneself and made a difference in one's thinking at some (perhaps very youthful) period, and the books that one can see have deservedly had a great and general influence. For example, I shouldn't feel like claiming anything of that sort for 'Our America' or 'The Mind in the Making,' though they affected me very much fifteen years ago or so. Also, I have not listed again any of the books you yourself have specified, though I should myself have to acknowledge the effect of Parrington and Veblen: not so much of Henry Adams (who has always repelled me), and not at all of Croce (whom I never read or very much cared to) or Spengler (whom I was perhaps too lazy to read but felt a strong distaste for at second hand).

"I am startled, in a way, to see how few French or German books I have read of this sort—books written in the last thirty or forty years, I mean. If one could go back to the eighteenth or nineteenth century, it would be a very different matter; but that is not the point. I hardly know what French or German writers *could* have had a great effect on us except for certain novelists or playwrights."

The note from Charles A. Beard was a brief one: "Sorry. Having trouble with my eyes and can't read or write much. Veblen's 'Business Enterprise' should be included. Brooks Adams' two books are thumping. Mannheim's 'Ideology and Utopia'—certainly. Croce's 'History: Its Theory and Practice.' "

Robert S. Lynd sends a list that is a sort of intellectual biography. "Instead of giving you a general evaluation," he says, "I'd rather try to list the books that have put the peculiar English on this particular billiard ball. Princeton was an intellectual vacuum for me so far as non-literary books go. I had to wait until I got out to come alive to all my present interests. Here are the things that stand out as I have fumbled around since 1914:

J. A. Hobson: Work and Wealth
Felix Adler: An Ethical Philosophy of Life
John Dewey: Essays in Experimental Logic; Reconstruction in Philosophy; Human Nature and Conduct; and his long opening essay in the group volume on Creative Intelligence
Veblen: Theory of Business Enterprise; Engineers and the Price System; Absentee Ownership; The Place of Science; The Theory of the Leisure Class
William James: Letters
T. H. Huxley: Letters
Clark Wissler: Man and Culture
A. R. Brown: The Andaman Islanders (chapter 5)
Samuel Butler: Erewhon
R. H. Tawney: Religion and the Rise of Capitalism
J. L. and Barbara Hammond: The Town Laborer (chapters 10-15)
Lewis Corey: The Decline of American Capitalism
Papers by Wesley Mitchell in various journals (later collected in his Backward Art of Spending Money)
Papers by Lawrence K. Frank: *e.g.*, The Management of Tensions, in the American Journal of Sociology for March, 1928; The Development of Science, in the *Journal of Philosophy, January, 1924*

There are more letters, and good ones too, but unfortunately there isn't space to print them. Louis Hacker sends a valuable list, including several books that others had completely neglected—Myers' "History of the Great American Fortunes," Mathiez's "The French Revolution," Zimmern's "The Greek Commonwealth," Trotsky's "History of the Russian Revolution" and a work I thought that everyone would mention, Sir James G. Frazer's "The Golden Bough." . . . Lionel Trilling wants us to discuss "The Sacred Wood" and "Mont Saint-Michel and Chartres." . . . Bernard Smith puts in a strong plea for Lenin's "Imperialism" and Pavlov's "Lectures on Conditioned Reflexes." . . . Says Leo Huberman, after listing a dozen learned titles, "Of course the books that influenced me most, certainly as a young child, were Horatio Alger's."

Our own list was compiled with the help of all this good advice. Quite naturally it embodies a whole series of compromises among conflicting points of view. On the other hand, it has the great advantage of being translated from the realm of pure speculation into that of articles actually written or under way. Here, then, are the books we chose, and after each of them the name of the writer who is going to discuss it in The New Republic:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. Spengler's The Decline of the West (Lewis Mumford)
2. Freud's The Interpretation of Dreams (George Soule)
3. Beard's An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution (Max Lerner)
4. John Dewey's work in general, with special attention to Studies in Logical Theory (C. E. Ayres)
5. Boas' The Mind of Primitive Man (Paul Radin)
6. Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought (Bernard Smith)
7. Richards' The Principles of Literary Criticism (David Daiches)
8. Turner's The Frontier in American History (Charles A. Beard)
9. The Education of Henry Adams (Louis Kronenberger)
10. Sumner's Folkways (John Chamberlain)
11. Veblen's The Theory of Business Enterprise (Rexford G. Tugwell)

This list is most certainly open to criticism. With Paul Weiss, we might say that it is overloaded on the economic-historical side and that it pays too little attention to science and philosophy. With Lewis Mumford we might say that it fails to recognize the modern tendency toward the *biologizing* of thought. It also neglects the *mythicizing* tendency that one finds in "The Golden Bough," and the whole subject of cultural patterns. A more serious defect is that it includes not a single Marxian work. Marx himself, and Engels, wrote too long ago to fall within the scope of our survey, but I hope (and hereby urge my colleagues) that we make room for a discussion of Lenin's "Imperialism." Our list can still be expanded.

But the faults to be urged against it are chiefly errors of omission. Here, in any case, are eleven books that have exerted a real influence in their own fields of thought and now deserve to be revalued. Here are eleven books that changed our minds. MALCOLM COWLEY

Books in Review

Mr. Thomas Blasts and Builds

NORMAN THOMAS' BOOK has a double aspect. In the first it will give satisfaction to many divergent minds because of its *saeva indignatio*. Mr. Thomas is indignant with the Soviet Union for developing a bureaucracy living in luxury while the workers are fed on tea and toast, and for sustaining a dictatorship by frequent purges. He is indignant with the Fascist philosophy which exploits the workers in the name of the state as an end in itself. He is indignant with the treaty-makers of Versailles, who provided the womb for fascism, and with the democratic statesmen who nursed their illegitimate child into gianthood. He is indignant with the capitalist-nationalism which, whether under democratic or Fascist forms, makes for war; and associates Great Britain with Italy in the murder of the Spanish Republic. He is scornful of the pretensions of democratic rulers to disinterested devotion to collective security, and waxes bitterly humorous over Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy, shouting for a quarantine against aggressors, while conniving at mass murder in China and Spain for the sake of trade and the Catholic vote. Indeed Mr. Thomas' cast of characters on the international stage reproduces Milton's assembly of the fallen angels, with Mussolini in the role of Moloch ("My voice is still for war"), Monsieur X in that of Belial and Roosevelt somewhat miscast as Mammon. If Mr. Thomas had completed his book a week later he might have had Chamberlain for the part of Beelzebub, as prime minister and procurer to the Lord of Hell.

It is true, those who resent these strictures will find mitigating admissions. Mr. Thomas does not minimize the importance of the USSR as an experiment in social planning. While it would be a satisfactory conclusion to the experiment to have the Soviet state gracefully "wi[illegible]away," he would not wel[illegible] danger of fascism lies far less in the milita[illegible]

of the Fascist dictatorships, and he appreciates the aid which Russia alone of anti-Fascist states has given to Spain. He declares in no uncertain terms that against Fascist attack "the workers throughout the world should give the USSR all possible aid." He admits indulging a hope for collective security through the League of Nations in the days of Briand and Stresemann. Even in the collapse of that ideal today Mr. Thomas reaffirms his faith by his demand for "the maximum possible American coöperation for peace; the maximum possible isolation from war"; and the statement, "What we want is to put war out of the world." While he is distrustful of international agreements for imposing economic sanctions against warmakers, he is apparently in favor of unilateral action on the part of the United States, accepting the argument of the National Lawyers' Guild that "aside from the general neutrality law there were treaty provisions under which all trade in military airplanes, etc., with Germany [and *ipso facto* with Japan] could have been prevented." Neutrality he would define as including "a refusal to supply not only belligerents but prospective belligerents with loans, munitions or the raw materials for war." I assume that Mr. Thomas does not include under "prospective belligerents" the prospective victims of the belligerency of others.

In its second aspect, which may be called constructive, Mr. Thomas' book serves to remind us of the points of unity among those who are striving to maintain democracy as against fascism, and make its organization an instrument of social values. His chapter on "Socialist Parties and Programs," with its record of splintering and quarreling, inconsistency and tergiversation, might indeed lead one to despair. Nevertheless, the fact emerges that in their common objective such parties possess a common ground which they might occupy without fighting one another. He is sound in asser-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theoreticians as well as conventional democrats had reckoned." He is prescient in the warning that "the failure of a more or less progressive capitalism, under governments friendly to labor, to meet economic crisis, invites fascism."

That is to say, the danger is internal rather than external. The intestinal disturbances in the radical movement, if they have no other effect, tend to increase the confusion, bewilderment and despair in which the Fascist cult is nourished, on the part of workers and middle class alike. Democracy must set its house in order, or it will be evicted; and to bring order out of chaos a procedure by plan is essential. The most important chapter of Mr. Thomas' book is that in which he shows that planning for a national economy does not necessarily involve the dictatorship to which the inveterate hostility of the democratic powers forced the Soviet Union, or their treachery persuaded Germany. The fear of the totalitarian state is an argument for the building of socialism rather than a deterrent from it. For in an uncertain future it is at least clear that unless the national economy is planned to serve primarily as an instrument of social values by the democratic process it will be subjected to planning by a process of which we have examples sufficient, it would seem, to make us wise unto salvation.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

Anthology of a Mind

The Complete Collected Poems of William Carlos Williams: 1906-1938. Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions. 317 pages. $3.

IT IS NO EASY MATTER to estimate the achievement of William Carlos Williams. One cannot feel that he is an important poet, and one knows that he is not an insignificant one. The name-callers have dubbed him an "objectivist," which has been wildly defined as one who adapts to his poetry the principles of pragmatism. By rebuttal this became: one who applies to his poetry the doctrine of pure empiricism. Then along comes Dr. Williams with a definition of his own: "A poem is a whole, an object in itself, a 'word' with a particular meaning old or new. The whole poem, image and form, that is, constitutes a single meaning. This is the full meaning of the term 'objective' as I employ it." This very neatly cancels out the other definitions by what is apparently a total, tautological eclipse.

Now Dr. Williams' poems are very rarely "objects in themselves" in any meaningful sense of the phrase. More usually they are observations and reactions, simple or complex, diatribes, fantasies, divertissements, occasional pieces—collected, they are the remarkable anthology of the experience of a highly individual mind. Like E. E. Cummings, Williams is an aggressive individualist, and his poetry, like Cummings', is most successful when most personal. True, like all individualists, he has consistently refused to be consistent and has written in as many manners as he chose.

Unfortunately, the manner habitually associated with his name is the stripped style, the end product of his early imagism and later naturalism. In its extreme form this style is little more than experimental, the application of a th[illegible]mon to most modern poets. His anti-poetic naturalism, [illegible] touch-minded humanity may well serve

She sits with
tears on

her cheek
her cheek on

her hand
the child

in her lap
his nose

pressed
to the glass

The paradox involved here is that this style aims at pushing to its logical extremes one legitimate element of his poetry at the cost of those other elements that occasionally combine to raise his work to its most distinguished level. It eliminates the vision that makes "Flowers by the Sea," particularly in its last two lines, one of his best pieces:

the sea is circled and sways
peacefully upon its plantlike stem

and it eliminates the humor and pathos that bring his portraits of the poor so intimately to life; the irony of "To a Dead Journalist," the sarcasm, the passion, even the wealth of visual detail that has been one of his chief fortes. The key to this paradox is to be found in Wallace Stevens' Introduction to Williams' "Collected Poems 1921-1931," where he defined Williams' poetry in terms of the conflict between the "anti-poetic" and the "sentimental": between what I prefer to call here the fidelity to the concrete impersonal fact and the seductions of the complex personal perception. Mr. Stevens acutely noted that the "anti-poetic is his spirit's cure" which he needs "as a naked man needs shelter or as an animal needs salt." As a passing commentary on the dilemma of modern poets, it is worth remarking that the opposition governing Williams' creative activity is very much the same as the dichotomy with which Yeats has struggled, and the function of Williams' "anti-poetic" very much like that of Yeats's "Mask" or "Anti-Self."

Dr. Williams' extreme "objectivism," then, is the deliberate stylization of the anti-poetic state of mind. In such a poem as "Young Woman at a Window" the poet is wearing his most impersonal mask; his manner, even his intention, may be overtly "objective," but his motivation, one suspects, is sentimental. He attempts to solve the conflict by arbitrarily eliminating the personal in favor of the impersonal, with the result that the poem, though it may sometimes hit off an effective ambiguity or implication, is more often nothing but an exercise in spiritual hygiene, essential to the well-being of the poet, but in itself hardly poetry. It is not when the conflict is eliminated, but when it is sustained in equilibrium and made to function as a physical law of the poet's universe that the most fertile condition for poetry is attained. Dr. Williams has attained this condition often enough to have added a small body of distinguished poetry to our literature. For the rest, his work is valuable as [illegible] public record of a private conflict that happens also to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Emily and Her Editors

This Was a Poet: The Life of Emily Dickinson, by George F. Whicher. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 350 pages. $3.

MR. WHICHER'S BOOK on Emily Dickinson is by far the best treatment of its subject that has so far appeared. He has spared no pains to discover every fact that is available; he has recreated the background of Miss Dickinson's life in Amherst, her reading, the literary taste of her time, her emotional experiences, and her relation to nineteenth-century ways of thought and behavior. The mystery of her much explored love affair is here, it seems, finally explained, and we can understand Miss Dickinson's character and her writing better than ever before. Mr. Whicher's book is not only a good biography, it is also an excellent piece of literary criticism; his analysis of the subject matter and technique of her poetry is sensitive, thorough and illuminating. He does not, to be sure, take into sufficient account Miss Dickinson's weaknesses—her often too "cute" intimacy with God and infinity, the at times annoying archness of her manner—but on the other hand he does not claim more for her poetry than it deserves and, by showing it so clearly and wisely in relation to her life and her times, he has done it a distinguished service.

Yet his book brings up once more the old problem that faces anyone who tries to explore Miss Dickinson's career: the problem of the perverse and exasperating secrecy which surrounds both her life and her works. Mr. Whicher is very temperate and sensible about the matter, but it is difficult for someone less intimately concerned than he to share his reticence and restraint. The situation is really preposterous. Miss Dickinson's poems have been edited by her niece and a certain Alfred Leete Hampson in a scandalous fashion. The editors have hopelessly misread Miss Dickinson's handwriting; they have perverted her rhythms and massacred her punctuation. And yet they have complete control of the manuscripts; no one, however trustworthy, is allowed to look at them, and it is only by careful guesswork that we can obtain a moderately accurate text of what Miss Dickinson wrote.

The worst of it is that her editors are not only unreliable; they are also—in a way very mysterious to an outsider—formidable. For fear of them (there seems to be no other reason) no one who knows anything about Miss Dickinson is willing to have his name used as a source of information. Mr. Whicher, for example, tells us that he has promised not to reveal where he obtained many of his facts, and he has obviously had no help whatever (he considers it, rightly or wrongly, an advantage) from the guardians of the manuscripts. What is the secret? Is it, as it seems, a case of extreme jealousy? Or is there something more peculiar still behind the "official" veil of sentimentality and inaccuracy with which Miss Dickinson has been so exasperatingly concealed? Perhaps we shall never know. At any rate, Mr. Whicher, in spite of the handicaps, has done much to clarify our picture of Miss Dickinson, both as a woman and as a poet, and all admirers of her work will be grateful for his industry, his discrimination and his critical intelligence.

THEODORE SPENCER

You CAN'T AFFORD to be without these reports!

THE DECEMBER ISSUE OF CONSUMERS UNION REPORTS—just off the press—contains enough buying information in itself to repay you many times over for the cost of a year's subscription. Read below how this fact-finding, hard-hitting magazine makes it possible to make substantial savings on your purchases.

SHAVERS A good lawn mower will give you about as good a shave as some of the highly-touted electric shavers on the market. This year's tests—which cover a number of new brands—show that out of 18 models only one can be considered a "Best Buy." Ten are rated as "Not Acceptable." If you are teetering on the edge of buying an electric shaver, wondering whether it will give you as satisfactory a shave as an ordinary safety razor, this report will help you decide.

1939 RADIOS Do the new 1939 models show any improvement over older models? Is "Mystery Control" worth the price? What's a good buy in a midget set? In a table model? In a console? Divided into five price classifications ranging from under $15 to more than $100, over 30 models are rated as "Best Buys," "Also Acceptable," and "Not Acceptable."

1939 AUTOS A preview of the 1939 cars, this report discusses the new features, lists price changes and gives tentative ratings of 14 makes based on automotive experts' examinations. In a later issue complete ratings and technical data will be given. If you are contemplating the purchase of a 1939 model car, you will do well to read both of these reports.

FOUNTAIN PENS You can spend as much as $10 for a fountain pen but a good deal less than this will buy you the best in writing quality and durability. Based on technicians' tests, 25 brands of pens are rated. Three are "Best Buys," six are "Not Acceptable." Also included in this issue are reports on GLOVES, BLANKETS, JAMS and MARMALADES.

To get the issue described above—plus issues for eleven more months to come—just fill out and mail the coupon below. You'll also receive, without extra charge, Consumers Union's 288-page BUYING GUIDE containing ratings by brand name of over 2,000 brands of products. The technical guidance in buying provided by these *Reports* and the BUYING GUIDE will enable you to make important savings—as much as $50 to $300 in a year. Can you afford to be without this guidance?

To: CONSUMERS UNION of UNITED STATES, Inc.
55 Vandam Street, New York, N. Y.

Send me CONSUMERS UNION REPORTS for 1 year, together with the BUYING GUIDE. I enclose $3. I agree to keep confidential all material sent to me which is so designated.

Name.....

Address.....

12R8

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Status of D. H. Lawrence

The Life of D. H. Lawrence, by Hugh Kingsmill. New York: Dodge Publishing Company. 288 pages. $2.75.

OF THE MAKING OF BOOKS about Lawrence there seems to be no end. Hugh Kingsmill's effort is distinguished from most of them in that it is not written by a former camp-follower. Rather it is a synthesis of the camp-follower's memoirs. Kingsmill's way of selecting the material gives it a sardonic unity. But there is no original research, nothing that was not already in the public domain except a few unimportant paragraphs supplied by "Mr. Jones, a Lancashire man," whom Lawrence boarded with in his school-teaching days.

The too brief childhood section is a pastiche of "Sons and Lovers" and the memoir by "E. T.," the Miriam of that novel. In any consideration of Lawrence the social background is quite as important as what Hart Crane called in his own case "the curse of sundered parentage"—but Kingsmill does not probe the social background. Lawrence's father had been in the mines since he was seven years old. We must think of the centuries of tradition behind that, the oppression and stigma. When Lawrence's devastatingly sensitive mother ("cut out to play a superior role/in the god-damn bourgeoisie") was fighting to save him from the mines, she was above everything waging class war. And although she did help him evade the killing work of the pits, the mines stayed with him, haunted him always; the fascinated revulsion he felt for them accounts for many of the recurrent images in his writing, such as his individualized darkness-motif. His life was in a way a modern version of the Persephone myth: although he escaped to the hot bright places of the world, there were things in his spirit that brought it continually back to the cold damp Nottingham mines where his former schoolfellows were laboring in the broken darkness.

All the way through his book Kingsmill fails to develop the essential implications. He is clever, even witty, and has made a practice of writing books about authors' ineptitudes. In some of his critical passages he detaches Lawrence's statements from their contexts in a way that makes them look absurd when laid out cold and dry. That does not truly present Lawrence, who was a man of special vision like Blake or El Greco. He made his own atmosphere, which has to be felt and understood organically, not in broken bits. Kingsmill's skeptical attitude will have a corrective value, however, if it helps discourage the Lorenzophiliacs who try too literally to worship the Master: as witness the editorial bubbles in the Phoenix quarterly published at Woodstock, New York, and "dedicated to Lawrence's ideals"—at least Kingsmill serves as a low bridge to knock off those who try to ride on top of the train.

The most valuable estimates of Lawrence have been in small and (not in the disparaging sense) incomplete books like Anaïs Nin's and Horace Gregory's. But Lawrence has never actually been "placed," as Proust, Mann and Joyce have been. It is of course too early to make a definite statement on Lawrence for the far future, but we need a judgment on him for the present phase. Kingsmill's anthology of memoirs fails to do this accurately. Part of the failure is due to his attempts, in the commentary sections, to demolish Lawrence the prophet. But Lawrence's prophetic side will be more clearly seen when it is understood that many of the arresting things he said were common-sense observations, given the impulse of the poetic utterance so natural to the man. Most of his pronouncements against modern society were justifiable, though sometimes they had a grating bitterness. But Kingsmill (who quite easily dismisses the homosexual charge against Lawrence) joins the chorus that calls Lawrence a fascist. It is not too much to say that the author of "Kangaroo" would have loathed Nazism. To compare his "blood-knowledge" theories with Hitler's feverish screams is to miss the difference between accident and essence in two given concepts. There is no relationship between book-burning Storm Troopers and Lawrence's fight against overintellectualization. The Fascists hate all intellectual processes, Lawrence hated the perversion of these processes.

Lawrence's principal message was one of life. This despite his oppressive ill health, despite his defeats and his tendency to use the ideology of death. (This last is often the sign of great interest in life. And it is a striking example of symbolism-in-life that Lawrence died in his middle years of the miner's occupational disease of phthisis.) Lawrence might have had a financially successful career building safe stories around the "humours" he could so easily touch into life, but instead he created his own direction and sought to expand the borders of the novel. His central characters represent the living urge in a far different way from the cardboard people we meet in commercial novels. Lawrence always saw through the rind of civilization to the primitive core: in England he felt Druid presences among the stones, in America

"THE MUST BOOK
of the day."
—JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

"BRILLIANT
journalism of the first order . . . a masterpiece of shrewd observation and far-sighted descriptions." — FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, *New Republic.*

THE GERMAN OCTOPUS

HITLER BIDS FOR WORLD POWER

by HENRY C. WOLFE

3rd printing. $2.50
DOUBLEDAY, DORAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it was the ancient brooding Indian spirit he felt, in Italy it was the underlining Etruscan culture. He saw his people in somewhat the same way, and their behavior is in the line of dynamic interplay between the primitive center and the "civilized" periphery. We must remember this, that Lawrence goes down to *lithic* essentials. Hugh Kingsmill misses the deep and the intrinsic, with all his clever assembling of the memoirs of those who came so close to Lawrence that they will never again point true north. All these personalia, like all the body of biased criticism from both of the extreme factions, have impeded response to what must—as poetry and as a profound statement of the civilized predicament—be regarded as one of the great reading experiences of our time.

HARRY THORNTON MOORE

New Books: A Reader's List

THE AIR DEFENSE OF GREAT BRITAIN, by Air-Commodore L. E. O. Charlton, G. T. Garratt and Lieutenant-Commander R. Fletcher (Penguin Books, sixpence). Very technical in its treatment of the limitations and military handicaps of air-fighting in general; very caustic as to Britain's air inadequacy; blood-curdling when it deals with "attacks on civilians" and "evacuations of dangerous areas." This booklet, ready for publication before the last crisis, was suppressed until the crisis had ended.

TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT, by Henry S. Dennison, Lincoln Filene, Ralph E. Flanders and Morris E. Leeds (Whittlesey House, $2.50). A group of progressive business leaders, believing in emergency relief measures but also believing that economic prevention is better than political medicine, discuss the possibility of long-range government measures to prevent another devastating crisis.

I BROADCAST THE CRISIS, by H. V. Kaltenborn (Random House, $2). An excellent job of recreating the period between September 10 and October 1, by means of verbatim reports of the radio speeches of Benes, Hitler, Mussolini and Chamberlain; and hour-by-hour news flashes and commentaries from the principal storm-centers. A valuable piece of contemporary history, with an almost frightening demonstration of the on-the-scene immediacy of radio itself as an actor in the crisis.

McGILLIVRAY OF THE CREEKS, by John Walton Caughey (Oklahoma, $3.50). Professor Caughey has collected correspondence, mainly from Spanish sources, which shows how Alexander McGillivray, a halfbreed Creek chieftain, by playing off one white nation against another was able to preserve the independence of his tribe for the generation after the American Revolution.

THE CHAMBERLAIN TRADITION, by Sir Charles Petrie, (Stokes, $2.50). An appreciative survey of the sixty years during which one of the three Chamberlains has carried the ball for British interests. The last section describes Neville winning his Munich victory before a larger audience than his father or brother ever played to—and with tactics of which Sir Charles thoroughly approves.

HOW TO RAISE A DOG IN THE CITY AND SUBURBS, by James R. Kinney and Ann Honeycutt (Simon and Schuster, $2). Dr. Kinney in this excellent manual gives the amateur owner complete coverage of a dog's life: how to choose a dog, its diet, training, love life and diseases. (Good news for prospective buyers: the city dog is not only

ARE you a pedestrian who has decided to cease being a pedestrian voluntarily before some motorist changes your status for you? Are you a motorist who has decided to equip yourself more powerfully to fight the battle of life on Madison Avenue, Main Street or Route One? In short, do you plan to buy a motor car? Then don't miss the article

AUTOMOBILES of 1939

by Dewey Palmer

Mr. Palmer, of the staff of Consumers Union, writes an annual article for The New Republic analyzing the new motor car models, pointing out which improvements are worth money, which are mildly useful gadgets and which are sales-talk. The annual article is always widely read. You will find it interesting and helpful. Look for it in a coming issue.

13 WEEKS' TRIAL OFFER $1

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street, New York City

For the enclosed $1 (check or money order if possible) please send me The New Republic for the next thirteen weeks.

Name.....

Address.....

12-21-38

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

healthy but lives from two to three years longer than his country cousin.) Miss Honeycutt's wit plays freely over subjects as diverse as housebreaking and the scars of unsatisfied passion. The thirty-one Thurber drawings treat for the most part psychological dilemmas—some dogs', some owners'.

A STRANGER CAME TO PORT, by Max Miller (Reynal and Hitchcock, $2). Wish fulfilment and tuna fishing for a middle-aged hero who runs away. His vacation measures up to the dream of business men who talk about retiring to shoot big game, but mostly wind up shooting somewhere in the nineties. Told in a quietly amiable manner, more ingratiating when it does less moralizing.

BURRO ALLEY, by Edwin Corle (Random House, $2.50). "Grand Hotel" in Santa Fé acted by a group of tourists and natives, including a murderer, a philosopher, a sex-starved woman and some Mexicans who have much in common with the boys of "Tortilla Flat." Shrewd characterization (especially of the Gringoes), tough wit and a fine ear for American and Spanish-American speech.

THE BOUDOIR COMPANION (Farrar and Rinehart, $2.50). Edited by Page Cooper. Another bout in the war between the sexes, with thirty-odd women writers—most of them not up to top form—here working for the most part with the raised-eyebrow technique. Man emerges cheerful, helpless and a clothes problem.

WAR IN HEAVEN, by Philip Barry (Coward-McCann, $2.50). Playwright Barry, turned novelist for the moment, tackles the problem of Good and Evil and gets all fouled up as the result. A few of the characters are well realized but most of them need actors to give them the semblance of reality. Mr. Barry, altogether, does better in the theatre.

Contributors

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT's latest book, "The Ramparts We Watch," has just been published by Reynal and Hitchcock.

H. N. BRAILSFORD, London correspondent for The New Republic, writes on history, economics and international affairs.

LEO H. LEHMANN, for many years a priest of the Roman Church, is the author of "The Soul of a Priest," "Ex-Priest and the Riddle of Religion" and "The Drama of William of Orange."

JOHN PEALE BISHOP is the author of two books of verse, "Minute Particulars" and "Now with His Love," and a novel, "Act of Darkness."

PHILIP HORTON is the author of "Hart Crane: The Life of an American Poet" and a contributor to The New Republic and The Southern Review.

THEODORE SPENCER is an assistant professor of English at Harvard University.

HARRY THORNTON MOORE, formerly literary editor of The Beacon, is writing a historical novel about the English Civil War.

NEWSPAPER GUILD OF NEW YORK'S
★ Guild Parade of 1938 ★
For the Benefit of the Emergency Fund
★ Richard Himber Orchestra Plus An All-Star Show ★
Fri., DEC. 16, 1938—9 P. M. Hotel COMMODORE
TICKETS: ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS

At World Famous
WINTER GARDEN
B'way & 50th St.
Evgs. (8:30) $1 - $3
exc. Sat. & holidays
Mats. Wed. & Sat.
$1 - $2

"Season's Unchallenged Smash Hit"—*N. Y. Times*
HELLZAPOPPIN
Cast of 100 — 50 Lovely Girls
"OLSEN & JOHNSON'S Uproarious Musical virtually rolls 'em in the aisles. The bigger they are the harder they laugh."—*NEWS*
Mats. Xmas Week: Dec. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

SOVIET PERIODICALS IN ENGLISH

MOSCOW NEWS—Illustrated weekly. 24 pages. "MOSCOW NEWS" contains, among features, weekly reviews of new plays, books and concerts; news and statistics in agriculture, industry and trade; notes in science, medicine, education. "MOSCOW NEWS" is an attractive, fast selling publication.
1 yr. $2 6 mos. $1 single copy 5c

INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE—Illustrated monthly. Devoted to socialist culture in the USSR, to anti-fascist literature and art of all countries.
1 yr. $2.50 6 mos. $1.25 single copy 25c

SOVIETLAND—Illustrated monthly. Its high lights: How Socialism spurs initiative and enterprise—Soviet practice proving superiority of socialist system of economy. Culture, art, recreation and education of the broadest masses. Feature articles on different phases of Soviet life.
1 yr. $1.50 6 mos. 75c single copy 15c

USSR IN CONSTRUCTION—Richly illustrated monthly. The beautiful pictures show in a striking manner the socialist industry, the Sovkohzes and Kolkhozes, the general culture, the people of the Soviet Union and their everyday life.
1 year $3 6 mo. $1.50 single copy 25c

COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Moscow News and Sovietland..... $3.00
Moscow News and USSR in Construction.... $4.25
Moscow News and International Literature $3.75

Place Orders With:
BOOKNIGA CORPORATION
225 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N. Y.

BOOKNIGA AGENCY
59 Congress Street, Chicago, Illinois

MEZHDUNARODNAJA KNIGA
18 Kuznetski Most, Moscow

Ask At All Newsstands *Catalogues and Samples Copies Sent on Request*

EARL BROWDER speaks
at the 15th Anniversary Celebration of the
WORKERS SCHOOL
Fri. night DEC. 16 MECCA TEMPLE 130 W. 56 St., 8:15 P. M.
TICKETS: 35c, 55c, 83c & $1.10 at the school office, 35 East 12th St., ALgonquin 4-1199.

SCOTT NEARING, Tuesday evening, December 20, "The Soviet Role in World Affairs," 6.30 P. M. "The Crisis in American Democracy," 8:30 P. M. Thomas Paine Society, 88 Seventh Ave. South, (I. R. T. Subway to Sheridan Square). Admission, each class, 40c.

WORKERS SCHOOL Winter Term Registration now going on. For descriptive catalog write to School office, 35 East 12th Street, N. Y. C. Telephone ALgonquin 4-1199.

PERSONAL

KNOW YOURSELF & OUTWIT YOUR TROUBLES. Meet the man who will analyze your personality and capabilities. Phone PLaza 3-9362 between 3 and 5 for appointment. Or Box 108, The New Republic.

YOUNG WOMAN, Hebrew, of esthetic artistic inclination, desires correspondence with those similarly inclined. Address: Box 111, The New Republic.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

CHRISTMAS DINNER all alone? Come, make merry with festive get-together group now forming. Midtown Hotel — Lucretia Randolph, 505 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.

IS YOUR ENVIRONMENT afflicted by adult infantilism? **CONTACTS**, the original clearing house for the mentally marooned, founded in 1927, connects intelligent people everywhere who enjoy discussing the problems of life by letter. Send 3c stamp, please. **Box 91, Station D, New York City.**

FOR RENT

ATTRACTIVE, comfortable, large apartments, well-furnished, conveniently located. $300 season. Tower Thru the Trees, 5416 N. E. 1st Court, Miami, Florida.

POSITION WANTED

SECRETARY-STENOGRAPHER, experienced, college graduate, knowledge social work, seeks office position, nominal salary. TR. 5-9059, or Box 60, New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED